

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1828.

VOL. XXXVIII.

Ω φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφυς Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἅ μὴ νοεῖς.

EPIGR. INCERT.



London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN; C. AND
J. RIVINGTON; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRET, CAM-
BRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDINBURGH;
CUMMING, DUBLIN; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1828

The Numbers are regularly published, on the first of April, July, October, and January. Subscribers may, therefore, have them with their Reviews and Magazines, by giving a general order to their Booksellers.

The former Numbers may now be had of all the Booksellers, Price 6s. each ; or in complete sets.

Articles are requested to be sent one month at least before the day of publication, directed to the Printer, Red Lion Court.

5979. 72.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXVI.

	Page
Notice of "Researches into the Origin and Affinity of the principal Languages of Asia and Europe. By Lieut-Col. VANS KENNEDY".....	165
Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his Defence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7. By R. PORSON	197
Extracts from Neglected Books, No. IV.	227
An Inquiry into the Truth of History	232
Cambridge Prize Poems, for 1828 : Hannibal ; CHR. WORDSWORTH. — Epigrammata ; CHR. WORDSWORTH.—Porsonian Prize ; CHR. WORDSWORTH.—English Prize Poem : The Invasion of Russia by Napoleon Bonaparte ; CHR. WORDSWORTH.—Greek Prize Poem : Αἴγυπτος ; FRED. TENNYSON	243
Necrology. Biographical Memoir of Mr. JOHN FOWLER HULL	259
Philological Remarks on Greek, Latin, and Celtic Words, by the Rev. THOS. PRICE, containing some Strictures on Col. KENNEDY'S "Researches into the Origin and Affinity of Languages."	267

	Page
Notice of CARDWELL'S Nicomachean Ethics.....	273
Laudes Sutténianæ : Oratio in Ædibus Carthusianis. C. E. G. LUKIN	303
Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1827. Mexica; CHARLES WORDSWORTH	309
Adversaria Literaria. No. XLVII.—Ἰακωβάκη 'Ρίζου τοῦ Ἀερουλαῦ εἰς ἐκυτόν.—On the Arabic terms <i>Haram</i> and <i>Haram</i>	316
Prologue and Epilogue to the <i>Adelphi</i> of Terence.....	318
Notice of "Viger's Greek Idioms, Abridged and Trans- lated into English from PROF. HERMANN'S last edi- tion, with Original Notes. By the Rev. J. SLAGER, B. A."	321
Notices of Foreign Works	324
Literary Intelligence	335
Correspondence	342

FOR THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION.

De Græcæ Linguae Dialectis. A GODOF. HERMANNO	175
Nugæ, No. XXIII.	187
Classical Criticism : Xenophon's <i>Anabasis</i>	195



THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

Nº. LXXV.

SEPTEMBER, 1828.

AN INQUIRY

Into the Credit due to DIONYSIUS of HALICARNASSUS as a Critic and Historian;—By the Author of ‘Remarks on the supposed Dionysius Longinus.’

[Continued from No. LXXIV.]

Περὶ μὲν γὰρ Ἀρκάδων τί δεῖ λέγειν αὐχούντων ἀρχαιότητα, μάλιστα γὰρ οὗτοι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γράμμασιν ἐπαιδύθησαν;

Josephus contra Apionem, lib. i. c. 4.

The Ænotri and Aborigines.

WITHIN a century after Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Jew published a history of his own nation, which, beginning with the origin of the world, and ending with his own times, comprised a space of 5000 years.

In disproof of the high antiquity which Josephus claimed for his countrymen, his enemies alleged the silence of the best Greek historians; and to this and other attacks on his veracity we owe the two books against Apion; in which Josephus without much ceremony asserts, that as to all which regards civilisation, the Greeks were but the children of yesterday; that their earliest pretensions to the use of letters reached no higher than to the time of Cadmus; and that according to the opinion which was then more generally received, letters were not in use among the Greeks so early as the siege of Troy. The Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phœnicians, however unfit to be compared with the Jews, were yet allowed by the Greeks

VOL. XXXVIII. Cl. II. NO. LXXV. A

themselves to have the oldest and surest traditions. As for the Greek historians, the earliest were little earlier than the Persian invasion, and they disagreed among themselves. Hellanicus differed from Acusilaus; Acusilaus found great fault with Hesiod; Ephorus exposed the numerous errors of Hellanicus; Timæus those of Ephorus; later writers those of Timæus; and Herodotus was the object of general attack. Sicily had its separate historians, so had Attica, and so had Argos; still, however, the narratives disagreed. Even in the accounts of the Persian war, the most approved authors were at variance; and Thucydides, though reported to have written a very accurate history of his own times, was frequently charged with falsehood. In the opinion of Josephus, there were two principal causes of these disagreements: the first and most powerful was the want of public documents; a want which both occasioned errors, and allowed the Grecian antiquaries to tell lies with impunity. Even among the Athenians, who were said to be Aborigines, and to be fond of science, the oldest of the public records were the laws of Draco, who was born a little before the usurpation of Pisistratus. *As for the Arcadians boasting about antiquity, what need be said of them? for they hardly knew their letters even at a period still later.*

So contemptuous a notice of the Arcadians may seem strange to those who give any credit to Dionysius; but let us not condemn Josephus hastily. Diodorus Siculus employed thirty years on his Universal History: he travelled over great part of Asia and Europe; he lived some time at Rome, and derived great assistance from his stay there; and he was cotemporary with Julius and Augustus Cæsar. From these circumstances, for which we have his own authority,¹ Diodorus was likely to be as well informed as Dionysius; and although the last of the three books, which he appropriated to the early history of Greece, is lost, the two which remain suffice to convince us, that in his opinion antiquity was obscure, chronology uncertain, and the historians at variance. The later historians, as Ephorus of Cumæ, who began from the return of the Heraclidæ, Callisthenes, and Theopompus, omitted the old legends: Diodorus, on the contrary, bestowed the greatest pains on them; and in his 4th book he gives us the history of the Grecian heroes and demi-gods from the earliest times. He begins, however, with the Theban Bacchus; and they, who are most conversant with the 4th and 5th books, will perhaps be the readiest to allow that

¹ Lib. i. c. 4. Ed. Wess.

these contain nothing which can justify Dionysius, or contradict Josephus.

At a much later period, Eusebius¹ of Cæsarea "collected the particulars of the ancient histories of all nations that had made any figure in the world, and then endeavored to arrange them with one another." *Omnium regum mihi tempora prænотavi, Chaldæorum, Assyriorum, Medorum, Lydorum, Hebræorum, Ægyptiorum, Atheniensium, Argivorum, Sicyoniorum, Lacedæmoniorum, Corinthiorum, Thessalorum, Macedonum, Latinorum, qui postea Romani nuncupati sunt,*" is Eusebius's declaration as translated by Jerome²; a translator who added occasionally, in what related to Roman history, and therefore cannot be suspected of suppressing any thing material to it. That Eusebius himself was not sceptical as to Greek antiquity, is proved by the Sicyonian monarchy; and that he was not fastidious as to authorities, is proved by his confidence in Castor. Yet, even Eusebius knows nothing of Æzeüs and the Æzei.

"Telchines et Caryatæ adversum Phoroneum et Parrhasios instituunt bellum—"

"Telchines victi Rhodum condiderunt—"

"Arcas filius Jovis et Callistho, Pelasgis in ditionem reductis, regionem eorum Arcadiam nuncupavit"—are notices which occur, but they are far from befriending Dionysius. In the first book of his Roman history, Dionysius mentions his treatise on Chronology: the work is lost; and was so little noticed, that Suidas and Clemens Alexandrinus are the only authors to whom Hudson refers us. We may gather, however, from Clemens, that Dionysius's account of Argos began with Inachus; and as Clemens makes the Argive government² under Inachus older by nine generations than that of Arcadia under Pelasgus the autochthon, we may safely conclude that the chronological treatise of Dionysius did not state that Phoroneus and Æzeüs were the earliest rulers in Peloponnesus. It is true that Clemens, in his *λόγος προγεγοντικός*, mentions the great antiquity which the poets ascribed to the Arcadians; but even Dionysius would not have required us to believe that the Arcadians were older than the moon, nor indeed that some of them lived 500 years.³

¹ I have not seen Aucher's edition, but I have the authority of Scaliger.

² *Stromatum* lib. i. p. 320. Ed. Colon. The text is evidently incorrect, but the sense seems clear.

³ "Constat autem Arcadas plurimum vixisse; in tantum, ut quidam usque ad trecentos annos vivendo pervenerint." Servius, *Æn.* lib. viii. vers. 51. If I recollect right, Censorinus quotes Ephorus to the same effect.

4 *An Inquiry into the credit due to*

We learn, moreover, from Herodotus, that Pan was the youngest of the Grecian deities; and Dionysius tells us that he was the most ancient and most honored deity of the Arcadians: so that Josephus may in some degree be justified by Dionysius himself, although Callimachus is positive that Arcadia was the birth-place of Jupiter.

But we will take a wider range. Herodotus mentions in his 8th book, that the Arcadians and Cynurii were the only autochthones of Peloponnesus who still inhabited their original countries; but he adds nothing to intimate that there was any thing worth notice in the early history of the Arcadians; and in his 9th book, where the Tegeans and Athenians contend for precedence, the *παλαιά*, which the Tegeans bring forward, reach no higher than to Echemus, the grandson of Phegeus, and vanquisher of Hyllus the son of Hercules. Larcher turns Phegeus into Cepheus, but he admits that Phegeus is the reading of all the editions; and he knows of no other Phegeus, than him who was the son of Inachus. I affirm, therefore, that Herodotus virtually contradicts the high antiquity of the Arcadian dynasty; I affirm also, that the civilisation or settled state of any part of Greece at so early a period is contradicted by Thucydides; and I infer from Plato's Cratylus, that in his opinion the barbarians were the earliest inhabitants of Greece; that in the opinion of Aristotle they were the earliest inhabitants of the country which was then called Arcadia, has already been mentioned; and in the Polity we are told also by that philosopher, that of all forms of government, oligarchy and *tyranny* are the shortest in duration: for the Sicyonian *tyranny*, which was the longest, lasted but 100 years, or about one-third of the time which some of the Arcadian kings are said to have lived. Isocrates, also, makes assertions about Athens and the Athenians, which, whatever may have been the boldness of panegyric oratory, would have required some qualifying, if the antiquity of the Arcadian kingdom had been admitted. Polybius was a native of Arcadia; but we have never been told that he believed or asserted its great antiquity. Strabo's geographical work was written after Dionysius was known as an historian: yet in his 7th book, Strabo states, that, according to Hecataeus the Milesian, barbarians inhabited Peloponnesus before the Greeks; but that we may infer from tradition, that almost all Greece was formerly inhabited by barbarians.

Plutarch wrote many years after Dionysius, and did not confine himself to the strictness of history; yet he confesses that he

had no fit materials for a life of Theseus. Theseus, however, was cotemporary with Nestor, and the great hero of the Athenians, of those Greeks, to whom we allow the priority in civilisation.

To mention the more author, we may learn from Lucian or his imitator,¹ that if the Arcadians thought themselves older than the moon, they did so, because they were ignorant and foolish.

We may now return to Lycaon the second. Dionysius informs us² that he had twenty-two sons, and that it was therefore necessary to divide Arcadia into as many parts. As our historian intended to gratify the antiquary, he should have given us fuller information, particularly as the necessity of the partition is our only reason for imagining that it ever took place. We may observe, moreover, that this Lycaon must be he who was turned into a wolf, and whose daughter was turned into a bear: two animals not very civil to intruders. Plutarch does not mention the number of Lycaon's sons; but he tells us that, according to the fable, Eleuther and Libadeus were the only two who did not share in their father's impiety, and that they fled into Bœotia. According to Apollodorus, the sons were fifty in number: all of whom, with the exception of Nyctimus, were destroyed. Pausanias gives the names of twenty-five; and states that Nyctimus was the oldest, and had all the power.

But we will proceed with our author's story. "On this account," (that is, as it seems, on account of its being necessary to partition Arcadia,) "Ænotrus having left Peloponnesus, and having prepared a fleet, crosses the Ionian sea, and with him Peucetius, one of his brothers. Many of their own countrymen followed them, (for the nation is said to have been populous originally,) and as many of the other Greeks as had not sufficient land."

Ah! tantumne tam tam negligenter agere!

If Tyrwhitt censured Speght, who remarked, on

'They couen so much craft on Wade's bote—'

¹ De Astrologia.

² I know not how I came to reduce the number to twelve in my last article. Perhaps my figures for twenty-two resembled twelve. Petavius, however, has made as bad an error on the other side; for in his *Rationarium Temporum* (Partis prima, lib. i.) he says, "Pelasgi Lycaon filius 50 liberos habuit, qui omnes, Nyctimo excepto, interfecti feruntur;" and Dionysius is one of his two references. Plutarch's anecdote will be found in the 39th of his *Quæstiones Græcæ*, where we may also find a classical reason for Michael Scott's losing his shadow.

"Concerning Wade and his bote called Guingelot, as also his straunge exploits in the same, because the matter is long and fabulous, I passe it over;" what shall we say to our historian, who tells us so little of a matter which is so strange—so passing strange, though not at all fabulous?

According to Homer, the Arcadians neither had ships, nor concerned themselves with maritime affairs in the time of Agamemnon. According to Herodotus, the Phocæans were the first of the Greeks who made long voyages; and they also led the way to a knowledge of the Adriatic, and of Tyrrenia, and Iberia, and Tartessus: according to Thucydides, Minos was the first who had a fleet.

"The reality of the Argonautic expedition has been questioned;" but the fiction, if it be one, may be alleged as evidence that no earlier maritime expedition had been undertaken by the Greeks; and if, not long afterwards, they fitted out a very powerful armament against Troy, we may learn from Homer that they were ten years in preparing it; and we may learn from Diodorus, that before the ship Argo was built, the Greeks had only rafts and miserable fishing-boats. But how easily does our well-informed, pains-taking, and most veracious historian reconcile himself to the expedition of Cœnотrus!

Seventeen generations before the siege of Troy, an Arcadian prince leaves Peloponnesus, and prepares a fleet, because his country was to be divided into twenty-two parts. A brother, and many of his countrymen, accompany him, and as many other Greeks as wanted land; so that we are to infer that Greece was already overstocked with inhabitants.—He crossed the Ionian sea.—In later times, this was more easily said than done. Hermocrates, a wise, experienced and brave officer, in the opinion of Thucydides, is represented by that historian as urging the Syracusans to meet the Athenians off Tarentum and the Iapygian promontory, and to show them that the Ionian gulf must be crossed before they contended for Sicily. Such a step, he said, would greatly alarm the Athenians; and make them consider that they had much sea to cross, and that it would be difficult to preserve order on account of the length of the navigation. Now at this time Athens was at the height of her power as a maritime nation; and it is reasonable to suppose that her ships were far superior to those which were used in the expedition against Troy, although these latter were probably not inferior to the far-famed Argo. Yet if we read the speeches of Hermocrates, and his opponent Athenagoras, and also the account of the inconvenience which the Athenians

suffered at the blockade of Sphacteria, we shall find that, even in the "most high and palmy state" of Athens, the crews, to use Mitford's expressions, "could neither sleep nor even eat conveniently aboard;" and that, in earlier times, at least, "light vessels, which with their oars could creep along the coast, watch the weather, make way in calms, and, on any threatening appearance, find shelter in shoal water, or on an open beach, were what Grecian navigation peculiarly required." I infer, therefore, that instead of being satisfied with the brief statement of our historian, we ought to inquire where CEnotrus built his fleet, and where he crossed the Ionian sea.

If he left Peloponnesus by land, we must suppose that a numerous band of adventurers travelled from Arcadia to Epirus quietly and safely; that they were joined in their progress by other adventurers; that they made no attempt to settle in the countries through which they passed; that they remained long enough on the coast to collect or build a fleet; and that, instead of suffering from famine, they were able to provision themselves for a voyage of discovery. Should the fate of our own African expeditions teach us that our supposition is romantic, we may suppose that CEnotrus embarked at some part of the Corinthian gulf, and sailed across to Iapygia: should this supposition seem more romantic even than the other, we may suppose, that like the Greeks of later times, he crept along the coast, watching the weather, and making way in calms till he reached Corcyra or Epidamnus. Corcyra, however, was not colonised by the Corinthians till long after, and Epidamnus was colonised by the Corcyreans; and that they both possessed great natural advantages seems evident, because Corcyra rivalled Corinth, and Epidamnus in its turn rivalled Corcyra. Here then CEnotrus and his companions would have found much temptation to settle; but, waving all objection to the passage of the Ionian sea, let us follow Dionysius. As soon as they reached¹ Italy, Peucetius disembarked his men and settled. The place of disembarkation and settlement was above the Iapygian promontory; and from Peucetius they who inhabited the adjacent country were called Peucetii.

This then is the earliest of all the Grecian colonies, and earlier by many centuries than the Æolic, Ionic, and Doric emigra-

¹ Ἀγρίονον. In this and many other instances, I have given myself much useless trouble, by trying to discover whether our historian's words were intended to bear a precise and technical meaning.

tions. Again, however, we have to regret a want of information on important points. That Peucetius landed, settled, and gave his name to the neighboring inhabitants, is a very scanty account, even if we do not judge by the bulk of our own reports on emigration. Yet, meagre as this account is, it contains more than we can substantiate. Strabo,¹ Pausanias,² and Iamblichus,³ intimate that the origin of the Peucetii was not Greek; and as for Peucetius himself, Strabo knows nothing of him; and we may gather from Pausanias that he neither was a brother of Ctenotrus, nor crossed with him; Apollodorus and Meander lead to the same conclusion; Pherecydes does not contradict it, except by Sylburgius's emendation; and Dionysius contradicts himself by making Peucetius settle in Peucetia before Ctenotrus settled in Ctenotria, and yet affirming that the Ctenotri were the earliest of all the Greek settlers in Italy. But let us follow Ctenotrus. Ctenotrus, conducting the greater part of the expedition, came to the other gulf, which is on the western side of Italy, and which was then called Ausonian from the Ausones, who inhabited its coast, but took its present name when the Tyrrheni became masters of the sea. Shall we let so strange an occurrence pass unquestioned? Dionysius represents the brothers as leaving Greece together; and his words imply that they reached Italy together. We must infer, therefore, that Ctenotrus left Peucetius in his new settlement, and continued his voyage along the Italian coast till he reached the western gulf. If we look at the map, and consider the ancient manner of navigation, we shall wonder that these "Shepherds of the Ocean"⁴ so unnecessarily undertook, and so easily performed, a voyage of such length. Ctenotrus is said to have

¹ In his 6th book, 11th section, Strabo says, that the Apulians are ἀμόλυπτοι with the Daunians and Peucetians; and in his 5th book, 3d chapter, he mentions the Peucetians, and those whom the Greeks called Daunians; but in neither place do we find any hint of the Greek origin of the Peucetians.

² Pausanias, l. 10. c. 13. calls them barbarians; and even if we reckon inclusively from Lycaon to Agapenor, we shall not be able to reconcile the chronology of Pausanias with the seventeen generations of Dionysius. As for Arcas being the son of Callisto, Douris, who, according to the Scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius, made him the son of Archomenus, will agree better with Aristotle. Pausanias mentions that the acorn-diet παρέμεινεν ἰσως, &c. which is no proof that Ctenotrus knew any thing about arable land.

³ See the 34th chapter of his Life of Pythagoras. Amsterdam, Ed. 4to.

⁴ "Whom when I asked from what place he came, and how he hight? himself he did ycleepe, The Shepherd of the Ocean by name." Spenser, Co. Cl. 64.

given his name to the country in which he landed; and we know that in Strabo's opinion the ancient *Ænotria* extended from the Sicilian strait to Tarentum and Paestum; and the opinion of Antiochus is also stated by him.¹ Now, without troubling the reader by stating and refuting different hypotheses, I will leave him to satisfy himself, if he can, why *Ænotrus*—whether he agreed or disagreed with his brother, whether he wished to settle near him or far from him, whether he knew the coast or not,—came round to the western coast of Italy. If *Ænotrus* really did perform this voyage, and if the two settlements were really made at this time, what shall we think of Strabo, who defended Homer against Eratosthenes? what shall we think of Eratosthenes, who took no notice of these settlements? what shall we think of Herodotus and his Phocæan manners, and the Phocæan settlement of Velia? what shall we think of Thucydides, who, not contented with not contradicting the statements of Hermocrates and Athenagoras, tells us that the passage of the Sicilian² strait was deservedly thought dangerous?

But we will proceed once more with *Ænotrus*. On the coast of the Western gulf he found much land fit for grazing, and much fit for the plough, unoccupied for the most part, and but thinly peopled, where it was occupied. Having cleared the barbarians away from part of it, he founded small and contiguous towns in the mountains after the ancient fashion. The territory which he acquired was large, and the whole of it was called *Ænotria*, and all his subjects were called *Ænotri*: this being their third change of name, for under *Æzeis* they were called *Æzei*, and *Lycaones* under *Lycaon*; and having emigrated to Italy under *Ænotrus*, they were for some time called *Ænotri*.³ *Triptolemus*, a satiric drama of Sophocles, is quoted in proof of this last assertion. Strabo, however, informs us, that *Ænotria* was so called before the Greeks arrived there;⁴ and he likewise instances the *Triptolemus* of Sophocles, and the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, to show the inaccurate geography of these poets.⁵ Sophocles, however, does not warrant any of the nonsense of Dionysius. That a part of Italy was formerly called *Ænotria* is evident; But if all *Ænotria* was to receive *Triptolemus*, the

¹ Lib. v. and vi.

² Lib. iv. c. 24.

³ I know not whether the similarity between *Lycaones* and *Lucani* led Dionysius to fancy that the *Ænotri* were called *Lycaones*.

⁴ In his 6th book, 2nd section, he says, that before the Hellenes came into Italy there were no *Lucani*, but that the *Chones* and *Ænotri* inhabited the places.

⁵ Lib. i.

inference is, that *Ænotrus* had not introduced cultivation there : an inference, in support of which *Isocrates* and *Diodorus* may be quoted, but which, as far as *Sophocles* is concerned, will need no other support than the absurdity of supposing that a drama acted at Athens and written by an Athenian, meant to contradict the popular story of *Ceres* and *Triptolemus*, and to represent the Arcadian acorn-eaters as the first cultivators of Italy, even when a passage, to which *Dionysius* refers, proves that *Triptolemus* was to sow there the fruits given him by *Ceres*. The quotation from *Antiochus* is as little to the purpose, for it says nothing about *Ænotrus*; and if the ancient *Ænotria* is to be limited to the Italy of that writer, its limits will be found in the following quotation from *Aristotle's Polity*.¹

"Messing together appears to be of old institution. In Crete it took place under *Minos*, and in Italy much earlier. For the learned of its inhabitants say that one *Italus* was king of *Ænotria*, from whom the *Ænotri* were called *Itali*; and the coast of Europe lying within the *Scylletic* and *Sametic* gulfs was called Italy: these gulfs are half a day's journey from each other. They say that this *Italus* made the *Ænotri*, who then were *Nomades*, agriculturists; and that besides other institutions he first appointed messing together: on which account certain of his descendants still mess together, and use some of the laws."

What is implied in the expression—*τὸν Ἰταλὸν νομάδας τοῦς οἰωτροῦς ὄντας ποιῆσαι γεωργοῦς*? *Larcher* quotes *Hippocrates* to show that the *Nomades* are so called, *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν οἰκήματα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀμάξαις οἰκεῦσιν*, &c. And *Adam Smith* observes,² "Nations of Shepherds have commonly no fixed habitation, but live either in tents, or in a sort of covered waggons, which are easily transported from place to place. Agriculture, even in its rudest and lowest state, supposes a settlement, some sort of fixed habitation, which cannot be abandoned without great loss."

The expression of *Aristotle* will imply, therefore, that, according to his information, *Italus* was the first who civilised the *Ænotri*; and the learned of Italy knew nothing of *Ænotrus*, and his arable lands, and his small and contiguous towns. It remains to show that the *Aborigines* of *Latium* have nothing to do with *Ænotrus* or *Arcadia*, and that *Dionysius* has made a very unwarrantable use of the names of *Cato* and *Varro*.

¹ Lib. vii. c. 10.

² *Wealth of Nations*, Book v. chap. 1.

TRANSLATION OF ATHENÆUS.

It is a circumstance in the annals of classical literature, known, as we believe, to very few, that the late Richard Fenton, Esq., F.A.S. (who in 1810 published a quarto "History of Pembroke-shire,") had devoted many years to a translation of Athenæus, which he completed shortly before his death; and we have reason to think that the manuscript is now in possession of his son, the Rev. Samuel Fenton, vicar of Fishguard, in Pembroke-shire. By a gentleman who had long enjoyed the pleasure of an intimate acquaintance with Mr. Fenton, we have been assured that his attainments as a classical scholar eminently qualified him for the task which he had undertaken; more particularly his critical knowledge of the Greek language and his antiquarian skill, which enabled him to illustrate, by numerous notes of elaborate erudition, the obscure and difficult passages that so frequently occur in his favorite author. Whether the public are to benefit by the result of Mr. Fenton's labors, or whether the manuscript is still to moulder in obscurity,—we take this opportunity of inquiring from some intelligent correspondent of the *Classical Journal*, what translations of Athenæus have hitherto appeared in the English, or any other modern language?—and, extending the range of inquiry, I have been often tempted to suggest, as a subject that would interest multitudes of readers, an account of all the translations hitherto made from the ancient Greek writers into English, French, German, Italian, &c. This account might be given in successive numbers of the *Classical Journal*; and would, indeed, furnish ample materials for a volume of considerable size if compiled with accuracy: the various editions of different translations being noticed faithfully, with observations on their respective merits and defects; and brief anecdotes of the translators themselves, whenever their history afforded any circumstance worthy of particular remark. That such a compilation would prove most acceptable to thousands besides "ladies and country gentlemen," (who, we may suppose, have forgotten their Greek,) is evident from the gratification which Larcher's Herodotus, Chaussard's or Rooke's Arrian, Langhorne's Plutarch, Cowper's or Pope's Homer, Smith's or Hobbes's Thucydides, Whiston's or L'Estrange's Josephus, and similar translations, have afforded to many readers perfectly capable of perusing the original works. And on the same principle might be recommended an enlargement of the plan, so

that it should comprehend a notice of all translations made from the ancient Latin writers. The facility of acquiring knowledge through the medium of translations, may, perhaps, encourage some indolent persons in their neglect of the learned languages; but we have ourselves known many instances where it was attended with a contrary effect: even those indolent readers are aware that the best translations would be rendered more instructive and more entertaining by the power of occasionally consulting the originals. To acquire this capability, an ingenious friend, whose literary education had, from extraordinary circumstances, been much neglected, was (although advanced beyond the meridian of life) induced by the perusal of Melmoth's Pliny to undertake the study of Latin; and in consequence of his success with respect to that language, he now aspires to the acquisition of Greek.

P.

NOTICE OF

Letters addressed to a Young Person in India, &c.
By LIEUT.-COL. JOHN BRIGGS, late Resident at
Satara. 8vo. Murray, 1823.

WE are fully justified, by the entertainment which this volume has afforded to ourselves, in foretelling that it will interest a variety of readers besides those for whose benefit it was more particularly designed—young men, proceeding to Hindustan, or residing there, as writers or cadets in the East India Company's service. To such it must prove a manual indispensably necessary: while officers of the king's regiments, gentlemen engaged in commercial speculations, persons, in short, of every description, civil or military, living among the natives of India, will find it equally useful and instructive.

The twenty-three Letters which form this work, and the excellent "Notes of Instructions" by Sir John Malcolm, given in the manner of an appendix, contain such admirable lessons as may enable any European, even of moderate capacity, so to regulate his conduct that he may not only dwell in perfect safety, but with comfort, among the most prejudiced and superstitious of the Indian tribes. For those numerous readers of our Journal, whose destinies will never lead them to "fair

India's coast," we shall here notice a few of the many anecdotes interspersed through the Letters of this work. Reproving his young friend for having contemptuously applied the absurd appellation of "black fellows" to the whole Indian race, Col. Briggs relates a circumstance that happened within a few years. One Jemsejee, a Parsee of Bombay, had risen from the class of common ship-carpenters to be master builder in the Company's dock-yard; and in 1800 constructed a beautiful frigate of teak-wood for the king's service. "The vessel had been built solely by natives, and was a proud specimen of the perfection they had attained in their art. During the preparations for the launch, to which the governor and all the naval officers of his Majesty's service were invited, it is said Jemsejee, having walked once or twice around the vessel, and elated at her completion in so good style, determined to commemorate the event, which he did in the following manner: having gone quietly below into the ship's hold, he caused these remarkable words to be carved on the inside on her keelson—'This ship was built by a d—d black fellow, A.D. 1800.' The circumstance was unknown for some years afterwards, until the vessel was brought into dock, and Jemsejee mentioned the fact and pointed out the inscription." (p. 17.)—He also built, in 1810, the *Minden*, of 74 guns; and received in return from the Lords of the Admiralty a splendid vase, with a model of that ship as a handle to the cover.

The degrading custom of striking soldiers in the ranks (now happily discontinued in the British army) was once very prevalent among our Indian troops, and rendered it difficult to obtain recruits, unless from the lowest classes. Of the fatal consequences resulting from this injudicious practice, our ingenious author mentions some instances. Within his own recollection, the captain of a troop of cavalry struck the farrier, who was a Mahomedan; the man indignantly exclaimed, "Sir, is this treatment for a soldier?" "The blow was repeated, with abusive language and kicks: the farrier, who was shoeing a horse at the time, and held the paring-instrument in his hand, (which in India resembles a sharp but strong sickle,) attacked his captain so desperately that he cut him in many places, and left him for dead. The man absconded; but was afterwards taken, tried, sentenced to death, and suffered: but he could not be brought to confess that there was guilt in what he had done." (p. 42.) Many instances, and abundant proofs exist (and some are noticed by our author in his eighth letter), showing that the Indian soldiers entertain feelings of the strongest gratitude and

personal attachment to the European officers who treat them with kindness. They often evince a spirit of self-devotion and chivalrous gallantry. Thus, at the fifth and last attack on Bhurtpoor in 1805; when besieged by Lord Lake, the native orderly sergeant attending his Lordship requested permission to join the storming-party, and promised that either Bhurtpoor should fall that day, or the general should never see his face again. The Sepoy grenadiers of the storming-party advanced under their gallant European officer, and even planted the British colors on the rampart; but the officer having been severely wounded, most of the Sepoys killed, and the position become untenable, all that could retreat came back, except the orderly sergeant: "disdaining to quit the spot, he stood on the top of the breach, loading a firelock he had picked up from among the slain; and when called to by his wounded officer, for God's sake to retire, he turned round and said, 'Tell Lord Lake where you left me; Bhurtpoor has not fallen, and I cannot show him my face.' He had scarcely uttered these words when he was seen to fall, and in an instant was hewn to pieces by the enemy." (p. 45.)

That an attention should be paid to the religious, or rather superstitious notions of the people, is inculcated by many anecdotes. We shall notice one respecting a young Englishman, who unfortunately shot a monkey near some of those temples, where animals of that class are fed by the priests and venerated by the multitude: this circumstance occasioned horror and consternation throughout the neighborhood; and as it happened that the European officer died on the following night of a bowel complaint, his death was attributed to the vengeance of an offended divinity; but from the result of inquiries made at the village, there is reason to believe that he was poisoned, not improbably, by means of his own domestics. (p. 69.)

The cruel and unmanly custom of striking servants our author justly reprobates, and notices some cases in which its consequences proved fatal. To an instance of this kind the twelfth letter alludes. An Indian servant in his master's presence folds his arms across his body, as the most respectful attitude of attention that he can assume. Ignorant of this, some Englishmen regarded the posture of their servants as an indication of familiarity or of insolence, which they were provoked to chastise by blows.

That the Indians must be astonished in witnessing our festivities will be evident, when we consider that none among them but the most abandoned of either sex ever drink wine or dance:

indeed, a "dancing-woman" and "prostitute" are synonymous terms. "Yet," says Col. Briggs, "the natives come to our government-houses, and witness our men and women of the first rank mixing together at the festive board; eating flesh of all kinds, from that of the cow (regarded as sacred) to that of the hog (condemned as impure); drinking freely of wine; and, to crown all, assembling in another room afterwards for the express purpose of dancing, and exhibiting their persons to advantage. This habit too, not confined to the very youngest portion of the society, is participated in by the grave matron, the mother of half a dozen children, as well as by the warrior, the statesman, the judge, and the divine. No wonder the Persian ambassador, on first witnessing a ball at Bombay, after seeing one dance, and perceiving the ladies about to commence another, observed with great politeness, turning round to the governor, that he hoped they would not put themselves to any more trouble on his account." (p. 98.)

On the improper conduct of some young Englishmen towards the females in India, our ingenious author offers many observations: he notices one instance of a woman who, having been seduced by money from her husband, was soon after punished by her own brother, who waylaid her one night, and cut off her nose. The Englishman felt himself bound to maintain her, and she proved a burden to him through life. (p. 105.) Another Englishman, a young civilian, considering the feelings of Indians as not worthy of regard, was in the habit of bowing and making signs to all the females whom he saw in houses as he passed along: the handsome wife of a Raj-poot of some rank attracted his notice, and he endeavored to communicate with her by signals and gestures. The husband, much attached to his wife, heard of this circumstance, and, although no impropriety in the conduct of his wife could be discovered, she was found dead one morning after, the civilian had been seen laughing and making signs in a direction towards the place, where he supposed the lady to have been. The husband acknowledged the murder, which he perpetrated to save her character and his own honor. He was tried; and the civilian, as a magistrate, was obliged to attend at his examination. The unhappy Raj-poot, convicted on his own confession, was sentenced to be hanged; and the civilian, for want of another person, was compelled to attend the execution. "This was more than his feelings could bear; but he wound himself up to perform the melancholy duty: after which, returning home, he sought relief from the pangs of his conscience by putting a pistol to his

head, and at once terminating his worldly misery and existence." (p. 107.)

In the art of tracking men or beasts by their footsteps, the Indian police-officers exhibit wonderful ingenuity. Col. B. mentions a horse that was stolen, traced for five days, and recovered at a distance of one hundred and fifty miles from the place whence he was taken. They trace a man through a crowd, follow him from one street of a village to another, and continue the pursuit until they come up with him. A thief-taker having in vain traced the footsteps of a man who had stolen a horse from the lines of a dragoon regiment, "accidentally recognised the same footsteps six months after in the middle of a fair at some town several miles off. The foot was particularly hollow, and left a very remarkable impression, by which it was known; and after several hours tracking, the police-man traced the thief out of the fair, and apprehended him on his road to a neighboring village, when he confessed the robbery of the horse, and led to its recovery." (p. 167.)

Our limits will not admit of any further extracts from this very entertaining and instructive volume, which is, most appropriately, dedicated to Sir John Malcolm, as the friend of our author's youth, and the patron of his exertions through life. Colonel Briggs, as we have heard with much satisfaction, is engaged in preparing for the press a translation of some rare and valuable Persian works on Indian history.

NOTICE OF

"*A VISIT to the SEVEN CHURCHES of ASIA,*"
with an Excursion into Pisidia; containing Remarks
on the Geography and Antiquities of those Countries;
a Map of the Author's Routes, and numerous In-
scriptions. By the Rev. F. V. J. ARUNDELL.
London. 8vo. 1828.

DURING a residence of four years as British chaplain at Smyrna, Mr. Arundell was prevented by local disturbances, and the difficulty of procuring assistance in the service of his chapel, from gratifying a very laudable curiosity which prompted him to visit the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse; Ephesus,

Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. Of those churches the earliest English account was given by Dr. Smith, chaplain at Constantinople. He commenced his expedition from Smyrna in 1671; but it appears from his relation, that a few years before some of our countrymen had undertaken to explore those interesting remains. They were visited in the year 1678 by Sir Paul Ricaut, consul at Smyrna, and by Dr. Luke the chaplain; in 1699, by the learned Edmund Chishull; and in 1702, by Sir William Sherard, whose companions were Dr. Pichenini and the Rev. John Tisser; but the account of their Journey still exists only in manuscript. Pococke visited three of the churches in 1740. Dr. Chandler has fully described five: omitting Pergamus and Thyatira. Mr. Dalway has given an excellent account of Smyrna, Ephesus, and Pergamus; and in 1817, the Rev. H. Lindsay, chaplain at Constantinople, visited all the seven churches. The foreign travellers who have examined any of them are principally Tournefort, Van Egmont, and Choiseul Gouffier; but their researches did not extend beyond Smyrna, Ephesus, Sardis, and Thyatira.

To ascertain the present state of those churches, and at the same time to accomplish some objects of geographical inquiry suggested by Colonel Leake's "*Tour in Asia Minor*," our ingenious author set out from Smyrna in March 1826, accompanied by the Rev. John Hartley; their party consisting of Memet, a Janissary; Melchon, or Milcon, an Armenian, from whom they had hired horses; Mustapha, and a Greek servant named Nicola. Through the influence of Lord Strangford, Mr. Arundell had procured a very strong firman, which embraced all Asia Minor, even to Cesarea. At Sedikeuy (a village near Smyrna), some Europeans have their country residences; here the native inhabitants, at all times miserably poor, were, in the summer of 1824, afflicted by a most ruinous plague; their corn and vineyards destroyed by locusts; and, to complete their distress, incessant demands made on them to supply food and lodgings for the Turks, who, in bodies of thousands and tens of thousands, passed through Sedikeuy on their way to Samos, allured by the prospect of considerable plunder. The means of those poor villagers were soon exhausted:

"The men," says Mr. A. "secreted themselves among the mountains, while their wives and children found an asylum in the houses of Madame d'Hochepied, and M. Van Lennep, abandoning their cottages wholly to the troops. Before they were reduced to this extremity, they had also suffered, as may be imagined, much personal ill-treatment; and an instance of the special interference of Providence oc-

curred, of so extraordinary a nature, that had I not occupied a house in the village at the time, and had the most satisfactory assurances of the truth of the story, I should have been as incredulous as perhaps many of my readers. Several *beyracks* or companies of soldiers had entered the village one afternoon, many of them composed of notoriously bad characters. Their chief, called the *Beyractor*, or bearer of the colors, fired by wine or rackee, sallied out in the evening, and pursuing a young woman who sought shelter in a house, knocked at the door, and tried to force admittance. The owner of the house, a respectable Greek widow, opening the door, attempted mildly to dissuade him from further pursuit. The man, enraged at the escape of the girl, drew his sabre, and made or attempted to make a violent blow at the widow. The hand of Providence arrested the stroke; the blade snapped in two pieces before it fell on its victim: the villain paused, as if conscious of a controlling power; but presently drawing a pistol, he pointed it, pulled the trigger; but it missed fire. He drew a second pistol, and was in the act of taking aim again, when another fellow, who had accompanied him, pulled him away forcibly, saying, 'let her alone; don't you see her time is not yet come?' Resolved on some revenge, the villain, though he returned the pistol to his belt, snatched up an infant child, and carried it off. Providence again interfered in behalf of innocence; and while the fellow was asleep, it was taken out of his arms by one of his own men, and restored to its parent." (p. 15.)

Among the ruins of Metropolis, nearly half way between Smyrna and Ephesus, our author copied some inscriptions, given (with many others on well lithographed plates) at the end of the volume.

His account of Ephesus, now completely ruined, occupies thirty pages. When Pococke, in 1740, visited this place (called by the Turks *Aiasaluk*), he could not find one Christian within two leagues around.

"I was at Ephesus," says Mr. Arundell, "in 1824; the desolation was then complete; a Turk, whose shed we occupied, his Arab servant, and a single Greek, composed the entire population." (p. 56.)

There were, however, some Turcomans, who had pitched their black tents among the ruins; but neither of the famous Temple of Diana, nor of the Christian edifices which succeeded it, can any certain trace be now discovered.

Proceeding to *Laodicea* (now called by the Turks *Eskihissar* or the Old Castle), our author quotes several passages describing its former state; little, however, can be expected here at present, since, even in the time of Dr. Smith, it was "utterly desolated, and without any inhabitant, except wolves, and jackalls and foxes; but the ruins show sufficiently what it has been formerly; the three theatres and the circus adding much to the stateliness of it, and arguing its greatness." (p. 86.)

On the road from *Laodicea* to *Colossæ*, Mr. Arundell's party entered a narrow path among rocks and pine-trees, forming a

scene wild and beautiful: here a small clear stream, which had flowed close by their side, to their astonishment, suddenly disappeared. Our author felt convinced that this could be no other river than the Lycus; and this the spot mentioned by Herodotus, (lib. vii. c. 30.) *Ἐς χάσμα γῆς ἐκβάλλων*, &c. At Colossæ were many vestiges of an ancient city—arches, vaults, and much broken pottery. Dinare, also, (a town of about a hundred houses,) affords an ample field for research among the inscriptions found here, one beginning with these words,

ΟΔΗΜΟΣΟΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑΤΩΝ
ΤΩΝΑΠΟΡΥΝΔΑΚΟΥΕΤΕΙΜΗ
ΣΕΝΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΝΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΝ, &c.

induced Mr. A. to regard this place as the site of ancient Apollonia; but this opinion he afterwards retracts; and in one of Colonel Leake's valuable notes we read that there cannot be any doubt that Dinare is the site of Apameia, as in fact Pockocke and Chandler had supposed.

"The inscription," says Col. Leake, "to which Mr. A. refers, is a dedication of the people of Apollonia on the Rhyndacus; a town which was not less than one hundred and sixty miles distant from Apameia; it cannot, therefore, affect the question as to the site of that place. It is observable that Pliny mentions the Apolloniata a Rhyndaco, exactly in the same form as the inscription ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑΤΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΡΥΝΔΑΚΟΥ." (p. 109.)

In search of many extraordinary vestiges of antiquity, seen by Paul Lucas on his way from Aglason to Isbarta, and which he describes as if they had belonged to some fairy region, ("l'on n'y remarque aucuns habitans; de sorte que l'on les regarderoit plutôt comme le pays des fées que comme des villes véritablement existantes,") our author proceeded to a place where he discovered a terrace of considerable breadth and extent, "not unlike the site of Hierapolis; and looking up to this," says he, "which was elevated at a great height above the road, we saw the 'fairy ruins' which had been the object of our journey." (p. 136.) Here his labors were rewarded by finely-sculptured architraves, and many inscriptions; one of which proved that it belonged to a *mausoleum* erected by Arlia . . . to her husband, T. Fl. Severianus. Here, among some fragments of bas-relief, was a large stone, with an inscription given in the plate No. XX. Near the terrace, in the almost perpendicular side of a mountain, were innumerable sepulchral vaults or niches cut in the rock, and having small entablatures with sculptures and inscriptions in front: here also were two well-executed female figures in bas-relief, and a pedestal on which Mr. A. discovered the following letters:—

ΗΣΑΓΑΛΑΣΣΕΩΝ
ΠΟΛΙΣ ΠΙΣ(ΙΔΙΑΣ).

Also, among the magnificent remains of a temple or gymnasium, another inscription exhibiting the letters

. ΑΣΣΕΩΝ ΟΦΛ

A theatre in good preservation, having forty seats almost perfect. These and other circumstances convinced Mr. A. that Aglason, as this place is now called, occupies the site of ancient Sagalassus: a persuasion confirmed by the resemblance of names.

On the road to Bourdour, our author found some poor Turks performing their devotions on a spot of green turf: they had the charge of several asses loaded with wood and charcoal.

"In a Mahometan country," says he, "how often will the traveller be put to the blush by contrasting his own indifference, if not total neglect of religious duty, with the piety of the Turk, who, be he where he may, and employed as he may, instantly abstracts himself from the world at the stated hours of prayer to fall on his knees." (p. 146.)

We cannot attend Mr. A. through all the details of his interesting journey, but shall place him at once among the three hundred Greek and three thousand Turkish houses that constitute the town of *Allu Sher*, the ancient Philadelphia. The Greek bishop here pointed out to Mr. A. some remains which he considered as part of the church of the Apocalypse, and dedicated to St. John. Our author regarded it as "more than probable that the remains of the church of St. John are really those of the first Christian church in Philadelphia." (p. 171.) Having heard that some Ms. copies of the Gospels were preserved in a church at this place, Mr. A. induced the bishop to make an inquiry about them: the priest employed in the search recollected having formerly seen some old pieces of parchment, but found that the children (*παιδιά*) had torn them all up. Mr. Hartley saw two copies of the Gospels on vellum at a school; but they were not very ancient. Mr. A. closes his account of Philadelphia with a passage from Gibbon:

"At a distance from the sea, forgotten by the emperor, encompassed on all sides by the Turks, her valiant citizens defended their religion and freedom above fourscore years; and at length capitulated with the proudest of the Ottomans, in 1390. Among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia, Philadelphia is still erect—a column in a scene of ruins . . ."

The next of the seven churches visited by our ingenious traveller was Sardis. This city, the capital of Lydia,

"identified with the names of Croesus and Cyrus and Alexander, and covering the plain with her thousands of inhabitants and tens of thousands of men of war,—"

ruined and restored—Pagan, Christian, and Mahometan—po-

pulous even five centuries ago, now "sits silent in darkness, and is no longer called the Lady of Kingdoms." "How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people?" A few mud huts, occupied by Turkish herdsmen and the tenants of a mill, now represent the multitudinous population of former ages: the only members of the church of Sardis being two Greek servants of the Turkish miller!

To Mr. A.'s book we must refer the reader for an account of the Acropolis, the magnificent view of the plain of the Hermus, the tumulus of Halyattes, the Gygæan lake, and the temple of Cybele, which the Turks have nearly destroyed for the sake of some lead by which the stones were connected. The remains of two Christian churches are still visible: one said to be the church of the Panagia, being almost wholly constructed of fine fragments of earlier edifices, and regarded by Col. Leake as "being perhaps the only one of the seven churches of which there are any distinguishable remains;" "but," adds Mr. A., "there are also some remains of the church of Pergamus," (p. 179.)

Of the two Christians resident at Sardis, one proved himself no great ornament to his faith.

"I was anxious to send a letter to Smyrna, (says Mr. A.) and requested this man simply to forward it by one of the numerous caravans which are almost hourly passing before the mill-door; and, as an inducement, offered to give him a Greek Testament. I had made the same man a present last December. He flatly and surlily refused to do it; while a Turk, who accidentally came in at the moment, voluntarily offered to convey it; and he was as good as his word." (p. 181.)

Indeed, on other occasions, our author contrasts the generosity of the Turks with the conduct of many who called themselves Christians.

We now accompany our author to Ak-hissar, the ancient Thyatira; a large town, abounding with shops, and said to contain three hundred Greek houses, thirty Armenian, and one thousand Turkish; nine mosques, one Armenian and one Greek church; the latter, a miserable place, so much below the level of the church-yard, as to require a descent of five steps: from the priest Mr. A. learned that the Bishop of Ephesus is the *Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος* of Thyatira.

"We intended to give him a Testament, but he seemed so insensible of its worth that we reserved it, as it was our only remaining copy, and bestowed it afterwards much better." (p. 189.)

Even in the time of Smith it appears that but few remains of the ancient city could be discovered above ground. There is reason, however, to believe that on excavation many valuable remnants of antiquity might be found: it is known that the in-

habitants of Thyatira, like those of Ephesus, were zealous votaries of the Goddess Diana.

The town of Magnesia struck our author as affording the finest view he had seen in Asia Minor. He notices also the steep ridge of Mount Sipylus; by the foot of which he and his party proceeded on their return to Smyrna. His second journey was commenced in September. On the road to Tripolis, he was delighted to find that accident had placed him at the very source of the river Cayster, τὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ ποταμοῦ: but he had not time to explore some ruins at Givli (Γέβλη). Near this occurred a strong proof of natural affection, as Mr. A. and his companions passed a small cottage,

"A young and very pretty Turkish girl ran out of it, and eagerly asked all of us, individually, (even my Frank hat was overlooked) if we had news of her brother? If he was come from Samos? How long since he had left Sagigek? Large bodies of troops had been assembled at the latter place to be taken by the Capitan Pacha to Samos. The innocent simplicity of this poor girl was truly affecting: throwing off that extraordinary disposition to concealment from the eyes of men, which is so characteristic of all the Turkish women, she ran out even without a veil, and forgot every thing in the idea of the return of a beloved brother." (p. 219.)

One main object of Mr. A. being to discover the source and trace the progress of the river Mæander, he set out from Bulladan, visited Tripolis, the Eumenian plain, Diuare, before mentioned as representing the old Apameia; Hushak, or Ushak, a considerable town, where carpets are manufactured, and, as Mr. Dallaway justly remarked, "the excellence of the ancient Phrygian tapestry is continued to the present day;" besides many other places, of which our limits will not admit particular notice. At Adala, or Atala, our author says,

"I went into the church, and found a Greek, who had just before arrived on horseback, earnest at his devotions, if devotion consists in making numerous prostrations, crosses, &c., before each of the pictures on the screen. I invited him to my room, and offered him a Testament; but he was quite indifferent to the offer, and in effect actually refused it, though he knew it to be the Gospel, and understood me when I read to him the fourth chapter of St. John. I then requested him to give it to the priest for the use of the church. He declined to do so, and I was obliged to leave it myself in the church. So near Sardis, (only five hours distant), and little more from Philadelphia, in so little estimation is the word of God held!" (p. 270.)

Mr. A. next proceeded to visit Pergamus; of which he noticed at a distance the grand plain and the majestic Acropolis situated on a stupendous rock. In the town, enormously high masses of walls formed a strong contrast with the diminutive houses beneath and around them. Those walls are said to be the

remains of the church of Agios Theologos, or St. John. The only church at present in Pergamus, is a poor shed covered with earth, and so dark inside that even with the aid of a glimmering lamp the figures on the screen could scarcely be discerned. For a small *vacshish* (or bribe), Mr. A. was permitted to go into the bath, where stands the celebrated vase,

"I had despaired," says he, "of seeing it, as the bath was occupied by females during the morning, and subsequently by men: the evening, I was told, was the only time in which it could be shown. But a little money will sometimes open the doors of any bath: and I was actually admitted while a number of females were reclining on the marble benches around the vase. Most exaggerated accounts were given by the keeper of the bath, of the sums offered by English *Milordi* for this vase; one was said to have offered forty thousand piastres, and another to fill it with sequins." (p. 289.)

From Pergamus, Mr. A. proceeded by way of Cumæ (famous for a temple dedicated to Apollo), Guzel-Hissar, or "the beautiful castle" (where he saw a handsome sarcophagus, some inscriptions and fragments indicating the site of an ancient city); a place called Menimen, of which in autumn the situation is extremely unwholesome; and concluded his expedition at Smyrna.

To the account of his two journeys our accomplished author has annexed a considerable number of curious and instructive notes, for some of which he acknowledges his obligation to Colonel Leake. This eminent geographer has also furnished him with a sketch, (given in p. 308.) showing the course of different streams in the vicinity of Ephesus, Lebedus, and Metropolis. A quotation from Col. Leake's journal ascribes to two causes the total disappearance of such a vast edifice as the Temple of Diana Ephesia. Its maritime situation facilitated the removal of its materials for the construction of new buildings during a long period of Grecian barbarism; •

"while the gradual rising of the soil of the valley, which has not only obstructed the port near the temple, but has created a plain of three miles between it and the sea, has buried all the remains of the temple that may have escaped removal."

Col. L., however, thinks it probable that so much still exists beneath the soil as would enable an architect to obtain a perfect knowledge of the plan and construction. (p. 310.)

A specimen of Greek as now written may be here extracted: it is a letter to Mr. A. from a person of Denizli, relative to the river Lycus and the ruins of Colossæ:

"Αυτο το Κιοκ Μπουναρι οπου απερνα απο το Ακ-χανη απιχη απο το Ντινιζλη δυω ωραις, και εινα η πηγη του απανω εις τον σορικω εις την ριζαν ενος μεγαλου βουνου, και καταβαινοντας ιως μισο καρτο ιχει μικρον βουνον, και εκει χαυνιται καμοντας μια μ-

24 Notice of the Rev. F. Arundell's *Visit, &c.*

γαλην λιμνην, και ευγαινει απο κατο αρου χαθη ως 500 πηχαις. The *Kiosk Bounari* (many springs), which you pass going from *Ah-khan*, is two hours from *Denizli*; and its source is at the foot of a high mountain in the south-east; and descending from thence half a quarter of an hour, there is a small hill; and it is lost there, forming a large lake; but it re-appears (re-issues) at the distance of five hundred pikes from the spot where it was lost." (p. 319.)

Whatever reflections may arise from the almost total disappearance of such interesting objects as the "Seven Churches of Asia," we must acknowledge ourselves highly gratified by the zeal which Mr. Arundell has evinced in seeking them, his ingenuity in describing those places where they once were situated, and his illustrations of their history by accurate references to the best authorities. His work, also, in other respects, claims notice from the classical antiquary and geographer; whilst the reader, who is neither the one nor the other, will find amusement in many of the anecdotes scattered through its pages. From the notice prefixed to this volume by the publisher, we learn that in transmitting his manuscript to England, the author was uncertain whether those friends, on whose decision he relied, might think it worthy of publication; and we are assured that no alterations have been made beyond a few trifling verbal corrections, "because," as it is justly observed, "in a work of this nature, the traveller's expressions written on the spot are always the most valuable:" and it must strongly recommend the volume before us to mention that several notes have been added by that able scholar and antiquary, Col. Leake, "in reference to his own researches on the geography of Asia Minor; the publication of which, as will be seen, gave rise in great measure to Mr. Arundell's journeys." (Pref. p. iv.)

We are perfectly aware that an author who sends his manuscript from a distant country to be published at home labors under numerous difficulties and disadvantages: he seldom finds the task performed by friends, however well qualified, in such a manner as it would have been by himself; and even while the manuscript is on its passage, works issue from the press, a perusal of which would be to him of considerable importance. Any defects or omissions which may be discovered in the present edition, our author will probably soon have an opportunity of supplying and correcting in a second. This volume is enriched with twenty-two plates of inscriptions, and a map well executed by J. and C. Walker, illustrating Mr. A.'s Journey and the situation of the Seven Churches.

NOTICE OF

An Essay on Ancient Coins, Medals, and Gems, &c.

By the Rev. R. WALSH, LL.D.M.R.I.A. &c.

London, 1828. 12mo. Howell and Stewart.

IN the first edition of this work, the author had almost wholly restricted himself to a notice of such coins as were preserved in his own collection: he has now considerably enlarged his plan; and several cabinets having been thrown open to him, more particularly the fine collection of Lord Strangford, he has introduced much additional and curious matter, tending to illustrate the progress of Christianity in early ages, an interesting but neglected object of "the medallic science," as he styles it in his dedication to the accomplished nobleman above mentioned. The additions comprise some remarks on those Gnostic sects, "who," says Dr. W., "formed so distinguished and striking a feature in the early ages of the Christian church. It may be thought that I have given them an importance to which they are not entitled: but I am disposed to think that the early ecclesiastical writers were competent judges of the state of the Christian world when they wrote; and I have not attached more consequence to those extraordinary sectarians, than I am warranted to do by the writings of their contemporaries." (Advertisement.)

Of some remarks scattered through the learned and voluminous works of Bandurius, Du Cange, Vaillant, Taylor (in his edition of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible), and others, our author has availed himself, and acknowledges his obligations; but he regrets that Christian coins have been so sparingly used in elucidating the spread and progress of Christianity. Coins, as he observes, are, like inscriptions on stone, more permanent and unalterable memorials of facts than the writings of historians. "There is not now in existence a single manuscript that was actually written by the hand of any author who lived a few hundred years ago, except, perhaps, the mutilated fragments buried in Herculaneum or the Catacombs of Egypt; but there are many historical documents in metal and marble which have survived the lapse of more than two thousand years, and are as legible as when they were first published." (p. 1.)

The first medal described by our author exhibits on one side the head of Christ; on the other a Hebrew inscription, signifying "the Messiah has reigned, he came in peace, and being

26 Notice of the Rev. R. Walsh's *Essay on*

made the light of man, he lives." Medals of this class, although regarded with contempt by Joubert and Pinkerton, are esteemed by Dr. Walsh as worthy of attention, having probably been struck by the first Jewish converts to Christianity.

Among the early Gnostics who corrupted the purity of the gospel by an admixture of Pagan fancies in the Apostolic ages, we find some who "held that pleasure was the end and true blessedness of man," chiefly the sexual intercourse; and, what no less offended the other Christians of that time, they indulged without scruple in eating of all meats offered to idols. They imagined various deities on whom they bestowed extraordinary names, such as Barbelo, Jaldabaoth, Caulauchauch, and Meitram: a practice adopted from the contemporary heathens whom Lucian describes (in *Nekuom.*) παράμιγνυς ἅμα βαρβαρικά καὶ ἄσημα ὀνόματα καὶ πολυσύλλαβα; "mingling with their rites barbarous and senseless words of many syllables." The names above given are perceived on many of the Gnostic amulets. A distinguished chief of this sect was Basilides, an Alexandrian, who flourished about 120 years after Christ, formed a new race of angels with extraordinary names, and enjoined silence, like Pythagoras, to his disciples. The sect of Ophites declared that Christ was wisdom; and that wisdom was embodied in the serpent, which they accordingly worshipped. But we cannot more closely follow our learned author through his very curious account of the Gnostics: their amulets, however, must be noticed; which they composed of certain abstruse words and mysterious figures engraved on gems and stones of various qualities, and supposed to have the power of guarding those who wore them against some particular evil; and the immense number of such talismans found, not only in the East but in different countries of Europe, confirms the observation of Montfaucon, who says that "nulla unquam superstitio latius manavit, ut ex ingenti numero lapillorum hujusmodi, qui quotidie eruntur, arguere licet. Hæc superstitio late pervagata est per Gallias, Hispaniam, Italiam, cæterasque Europæ regiones," &c. (*Supplem. tom. ii.*)

It was Dr. Walsh's intention to give engravings of such gems as have not been already made known through the plates of Kircher or of Montfaucon, although the latter has published three hundred. The first exhibited in this work is a beautiful chrysoprase from Lord Strangford's cabinet; on one side is a right line, crossed by three curved lines, a device common on the Gnostic gems, but not yet explained. This is surrounded by the legend ABPACAΞ ΙΑΩ: words of common use on

antiques° of this class; Abrasax or Abraxas implying the Supreme Deity, and formed of letters comprising the mystic number 365. Abrasax was the same as Meithras, the sun of the Gentiles; and his mysteries were celebrated with Christian ceremonies. The word ΙΑΩ is generally supposed to be a corruption of the Hebrew tetragrammaton יהוה, Jehovah, that name to the letters of which such awful importance was attached by the Jews: but our author seems inclined to regard the Ι as implying Jesus, and the ΑΩ as the alpha and omega of the Revelations. On the other face of this gem is a serpent coiled into a knot, with a lion's head, from which nine rays appear to issue: various circumstances render it evident that among the Gnostics Christ was identified with the serpent. This creature is sometimes found combined with other figures: thus, on a bloodstone of Lord Strangford's collection, two serpents form the legs of a human body, which is surmounted with a cock's head: the mystic word ΙΑΩ here appears between the serpent-like feet. We next find a class of gems called *κρανόμορφοι*: these exhibit figures with the head of a hawk: the *κυνόμορφοι* have the heads of dogs. A gem (No. 10.) represents Mercury with his caduceus and other attributes, but having three legs. The letters AN seem to identify him with Anubis: and in the next gem, (No. 11.) Anubis and Mercury appear united in the form of a human body with two faces; the lower part of the body resembling a dog's; in one hand is a caduceus, in the other a club, the symbol of Anubis.

Our limits oblige us to pass over many interesting observations, and proceed to the gem, No. 18. which is "highly characteristic of the Gnostic sects as they were depicted by contemporary writers. It is a cornelian, but in the form of a seal-ring, and probably worn as such. It is in the collection of Dr. Adam Clarke, and was obtained by him from a soldier who brought it from Egypt on the return of the English army from that country. The surface is covered with Gnostic figures and characters, interspersed with priapi, phalli, and other emblems, which I do not undertake to explain. It is, however, a highly valuable relic, as confirming all the Christian historians have written on the obscenity of these impure and mysterious Christians, who, in the words of the apostle, 'crept in unawares, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness.'" (p. 69.)

On many other gems various devices are found, in which Grecian, Egyptian, and Christian emblems and inscriptions appear mingled together—sphinxes and apes with deities of Greece and Rome, having for legends words taken from the sacred Scriptures.

28 *Notice of the Rev. R. Walsh's Essay, &c.*

On one is Diana with her bow and crescent, and the legend ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ. On another, Hercules striking the Nemean lion, accompanied by the Hebrew word ΑΔΩΝΑΙ, Lord. Some were evidently designed as amulets to protect the wearer from spiritual evils, as that with the words, ΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ ΑΔΩΝΑΙ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΔΕΞΙΑΙ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΣ ΦΥΛΑΞΑΤΕ ΟΥΒΙΑΝ ΠΑΥΛΙΝΑΝ ΑΠΟ ΠΑΝΤΙ ΚΑΚΟΥ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΟΣ: "Lord, Abrasax, holy name, propitious powers, protect Vivia Paulina from every evil spirit." A remarkable gem exhibits Apollo with a star or sun, and on the other side an inscription ΙΕCΥC ΧΡΙCΤΥC identifying Christ with Apollo and the Sun; and on many are seen "figures of monkeys as priapi, naked women in indecent attitudes, and other obscenities, indicating, as well as the one I have exhibited, (No. 18.) the gross and sensual indulgences of the people for whom they were fabricated, and coinciding in a remarkable degree with the opinions and practices of those polluted Christians, as they are represented by the early fathers of the church. These figures and many others will be found in Kircher and Montfaucon, particularly the latter." (p. 71.)

Our author now proceeds to examine some coins of Diocletian and Maximian, Constantine the Great, Constantius, Magnentius, Decentius, Julian the Apostate, Jovian, Gratianus, Theodosius the Great, Justinian, Focas, Justinian Rhinometus, Leo, Constantine, and Johaunes Zemiscas: but for his learned explanations of their devices and inscriptions we must refer our readers to the Essay itself, merely noticing that on a coin of Constantine the Great he would render the legend "CONSTANTINO PIO AUGUSTO BAPTISMA TE NATO—To Constantine, the pious, august, born or regenerate in baptism:" and he explains the letters PLC on the exergue, by "Pecunia Londini cusa"—money coined at London. (p. 95.)

Dr. Walsh, already well known as the ingenious author of "A Journey from Constantinople to England," has dedicated this Essay to Lord Strangford, whose cabinet afforded him such valuable materials: and besides thirty-eight well-executed plates of gems and coins, the volume is embellished with a frontispiece representing the front of a Christian temple, erected by the Emperor Jovian, A.D. 304. in the island of Corfu.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

Select Corrections of Metrical Errata in the Homeric Poems, on the "Theory of the Particles:" compiled from H. W. WILLIAMS'S "Critical Investigation of the Versification and Prosodial Usages of the Iliad and Odyssey." 8vo. pp. 88. Pr. 4s. 6d. Simpkin and Marshall. London, 1828.

"THE theory of the Particles" is introduced by Mr. Williams in connexion with his remarks on the admission of an amphibrach into Homeric hexameters. After quoting those verses of the Iliad and Odyssey, in which an amphibrach is at present found, viz. Il. A. 193. K. 507. Λ. 411. P. 106. Σ. 15; Od. Δ. 120. E. 365. 424.

"Ἔως ὃ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν.

Il. O. 539. "Ἔως ὃ τῷ πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' ἤλπετο νίκην.

Il. Φ. 602. "Ἔως ὃ τὸν πεδίῳ διώκετο

Od. Δ. 90. "Ἔως ἐγὼ περὶ κείνα πολὺν

Il. 280. "Ἄλλ' ἀναχασσάμενος νῆχον πάλιν, ἔως ἐπῆλθον.

I. 233. "Ἥμενοι, ἔως ἐπῆλθε νέμων

N. 315. "Ἔως ἐνὶ Τροίῃ πολεμίζομεν

O. 109. Βὰν δ' ἰέναι προτέρω διὰ δώματος, ἔως ἵκοντο.

T. 367. "Ὅσσα σὺ τῷ ἐδίδως, ἀρώμενος ἔως ἵκοιο.

and mentioning the opinions of Barnes, Clarke, Heyne, and Hermann respecting them, he observes :

"In the last place, Bentley alters the first line brought forward to,

"Ἔως ὅγε ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν.

and so also with Il. O. 539. Il. Φ. 602; adducing in support of his opinion, Od. E. 386. "Ἔως ὅγε Φαίηκεσσι. That in this particular the above great critic is correct, as likewise that in the remaining passages Homer wrote, "Ἔως ἄρ' ἐγὼ, ἔως ἄρ' ἐπῆλθον, ἔως ἄρ' ἐπῆλθε, "Ἔως ἄρ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ, ἔως ἄρ' ἵκοντο, ἔως ἄρ' ἵκοιο, there can be little question : every hypothesis which attempts at reconciling the present readings to a dactylic hexameter, outrages the consistency and beauty of Homeric poetry. But it is certainly a most singular circumstance, that in ten several places ἔως ὃ should be written for ἔως ὅγε, and that in seven others ἔως should be written for ἔως ἄρ'; and such a coincidence can scarcely be considered accidental. It was these passages more particularly, that first suggested what may be appropriately termed, "*the theory of the particles*;" which supposes that in the first transcription of the Homeric poems, certain marks understood by the parties for whom the copies were designed, were employed for the particles ἄρα, ἄρ, ῥα, and γε, which are not essential either to the sense or

the grammatical construction, but are intended to add emphasis to the word or expression to which they are joined; of which marks, it is reasonable to imagine that the primitive transcribers occasionally lost sight, as also, that sometimes, when their spirits were fresh, they treated the insertion of the particles themselves and the use of the marks with indifference. At the period of the rearrangement of the poems, these marks could scarcely have been intelligible; and hence, in order to restore what was conceived to be metrical propriety, alterations may in many places have been made by unskilful and comparatively illiterate persons, whilst in others the defective readings may have been continued. To elucidate the matter in question, we shall here present the reader with a few passages, illustrative of the use which Homer makes of these particles; premising that *ἄρα* and *ἤρ* are joined to expressions or combinations of words, *ῥα* both to expressions and single words, and *γε* to single words only; and that the first three, which are only different forms of the same particle, give emphasis positively, whilst the last does comparatively:

Il. Ψ. 125, 6. Καὶ δ' ἤρ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς βάλλον ἐπισχερῶν, ἐνθ' ἤρ'
Ἀχιλλεύς

Φράσσατο κ. τ. λ.

Il. Ω. 337. "Ὡς ἄγαγ', ὡς μήτ' ἤρ τις ἴδῃ, μήτ' ἤρ τε νοήσῃ . . .

Od. A. 346. Μήτηρ ἐμή, τί τ' ἤρ' αὖ φθονέεις, ἐρίηρον αἰοιδῶν . . .

Γ. 430. "Ὡς ἔφαθ'· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντας ἐποίπνυσιν· ἦλθε μὲν ἤρ' ῥοῦς . . .

— 469. Πάρ δ' ἄρα Νέστορ' ἰὼν κατ' ἤρ' ἔζητο, ποιμένι λαῶν . . .

— 143, 4. Οὐδ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πάμπαν ἐήνδανε· βούλετο γάρ ῥα

Λαὸν ἐρυκακέειν, κ. τ. λ.

Θ. 186. Ἥ ῥα, καὶ αὐτῇ κ. τ. λ.

Il. X. 266, 7. "Ὀρκια ἔσπονται, πρίν γ' ἢ ἕτερόν γε πεσούτα

Αἵματος ἄσαι κ. τ. λ.

Od. Π. 447. "Ἐκ γε μνηστήρων· κ. τ. λ.

— P. 62, 3. ἄμα τῷ γε κύνας πύδας ἀργοὶ ἔποντο·

Θεσπεσίην δ' ἄρα τῷ γε χάριν κατέχευεν Ἀθήνη.

"It may be productive of advantage to refer likewise to the following: Il. Γ. 113. 221. 344. 395. 447, 8. Δ. 15. 106. N. 353. Ω. 31. 40. Od. A. 346. Δ. 264. 566. E. 369. Θ. 168. K. 403. Π. 245; Il. Γ. 176, 8. 180. M. 217. P. 270. 735. 746. Υ. 266. Φ. 103. X. 280. 302. Ω. 426. Od. Γ. 122. Δ. 810. Λ. 429. Π. 447. P. 62, 3. 384. Σ. 105. 163. T. 27. 315. Υ. 245. Φ. 98. Ω. 288. From these passages it will be seen, in what a latitude these particles are used in the Iliad and Odyssey; and it may be safely affirmed, that by the introduction of these particles, more than one half of the metrical anomalies that disgrace our present copies of the poems, may be easily and satisfactorily removed. Viewed then in its general bearings, the theory we have advanced cannot but be held consistent and probable. But there are numerous other passages, in addition to those in which ap-

parently an amphibrach occurs, that serve particularly to recommend this theory. In Il. Δ. 506. E. 343. Ε. 421. Ψ. 213. 317. Σ. 160. Od. Κ. 323, we have μέγα ἱαχον, μέγα ἱαχουσα, &c.; whilst in Il. Δ. 482., Σ. 228, we read μεγάλ' ἱαχε, and in Il. Σ. 29, and Φ. 10, μεγάλ' ἱαχον. Now supposing it to have been allowable to use the last syllable of μέγα so situated as the first of a foot, by the power of the metrical accent, (a proposition, to our mind, too extravagant to be received,) would not the principles of Homer's versification have required him to employ μεγάλ' in preference? Most assuredly, as will be presently demonstrated; and it is thus manifest, that μέγα cannot be the true reading: still we can scarcely embrace μεγάλ', as we should thus leave the remarkable circumstance unaccounted for, that μεγάλ' is constantly found in our present copies, when the second syllable is *in thesi*, and μέγα when it is *in arsi*. It is evident that in the above instances, Homer gave not μέγα ἱαχον, but μέγα ῥ' ἱαχον, not μέγα ἱαχουσα, but μέγα ῥ' ἱαχουσα, &c. Again in Il. Τ. 399. we read,

Σμερδαλέον δ' ἔπποισιν ἐκέλετο, πατρὸς ἑοῖο.

and why was not σμερδαλέον used for σμερδαλέα, Il. Ε. 302. Θ. 321. Μ. 205. Il. 785. Τ. 41. Υ. 285. 382. 443. Od. X. 81? It is almost beyond dispute, that σμερδαλέα ῥ' is the true reading in these passages. It would be very possible also to advert to numerous passages in support of the theory, which are not particularly connected with any metrical regulation we have to discuss; but we content ourselves with the evidence which has been furnished, and which will be furnished, in the following pages"

On this theory are founded very many of the emendations contained in this treatise: from which, as being the most striking, we have selected the following:

Od. O. 83. Λῦτως ἄπυπέμψει, δώσει δέ τι ἐν γε φέρεσθαι.

Read, Αὔτως ἄρ πέμψει,

Il. Τ. 35. Μῆνιν ἀπὸειπὼν Ἀγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν.

Read, Μῆνιν ἀπὸ ῥ' εἰπὼν

Il. Φ. 283. "Ὀν ῥα τ' ἐναυλος ἀπόδησση χερσὶν ἰαχῶνι περῶντα.

Read, "Ὀν ῥα τ' ἐναυλος ἀπὸ ῥ' ἔρση

Il. Φ. 329. Μή μιν ἀπὸέρσειε μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης.

Read, Μή μιν ἀπὸ ῥ' ἔρσειε

Il. Η. 142. Τὸν Λυκόοργος ἔπεφνε δόλφ, οὔτι κράτει γε.

Read, οὔτι ῥα κράτει γε.

Il. O. 478. "Ὡς φάθ'· ὁ δὲ τόξον μὲν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἔθηκεν.

Read, "Ὡς φάθ'· ὁ δ' ἄρ τόξον

Il. Γ. 172. Αἰδοῖός τέ μοι ἔσσι, φίλῃ ἐκυρῇ, δεινός τε.

Read, φίλῃ ῥ' ἐκυρῇ, δεινός τε.

Corrections similar to this last are proposed for Il. Β. 781. Δ.

456. M. 144. O. 396. Π. 366. E. 576. Z. 62. O. 275. Π. 373;
Od. I. 393. N. 213. P. 37. T. 54. 484. Φ. 209. Ψ. 102. 170.
Ω. 321.

II. B. 264. Πεπληγὼς ἀγορῆθεν ἀπεικέσσι πληγῇσιν.

Read, ἀεικέσι ῥα πληγῇσιν.

II. A. 444. Ἡματι τῷδ' ἔσσεσθαι ἐμῷ δ' ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντα.

Read, Ἡματι τῷδ' ἔσσεσθαι

II. P. 144. Φράζεο νῦν, ὅπως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ σῴσῃς.

Read, Φράζεο νῦν, πῶς ἔρ κε πόλιν καὶ ῥ' ἄστυ σῴσῃς.

Od. Ψ. 115. Νῦν δ' ὅτι ῥυπύω, κακὰ δὲ χροὶ εἴματα εἶμαι.

Read, Νῦν δ' ἄρ' ὅτι ῥυπύω,

II. Z. 81. Πάντη ἐποικόμενος, πρὶν αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν.

Read, πρὶν γ' αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν.

This emendation is supported by II. Σ. 189, 190. Λ. 266; Od. B. 374. Σ. 288, &c. It is to be made also in II. I. 403. N. 172. II. 322. X. 156; Od. N. 113.

Od. Θ. 215. Εἰ μὲν τόξον οἶδα ἐύξοον ἀμφαφάσθαι.

Read, Εἰ μὲν τόξον γ' οἶδα

II. P. 112. Ἐκτόρ, εἶδος ἄριστε, μάχης ἄρα πολλὸν ἔδεύεο.

Read, Ἐκτόρ, ἄριστ' εἰδός γε,

II. E. 358. Πολλὰ λισσομένη, χρυσάμπυκας ἦτεεν ἵππους.

Read, Πολλὰ γε λισσομένη,

The same correction is proposed for II. Φ. 368. X. 91. Ω. 755. Od. N. 438. Σ. 108.

II. I. 440. Νήπιον, οὕπως εἰδὸθ' ὁμοίου πολέμοιο.

Read, ὁμοίου ἄρ πολέμοιο.

So likewise in, N. 358. Σ. 242. Φ. 294; Od. Σ. 263. Ω. 542.

II. O. 66. Ἰλίου προπάροιθε, πολεῖς ὁλέσαντ' αἰζηούς.

Read, Ἰλίου ῥα προπάροιθε,

So likewise in Φ. 104. X. 6.

II. E. 487. Μήπως, ὥς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἑλόντε πανάγρου.

Read, λίνου ῥα πανάγρου ἁλόντες.

II. A. 36. Τῇ δ' ἐπὶ μὲν Γοργῷ βλοσυρῶπις ἑστεφάνωτο.

Read, βλοσυρῶπις γ' ἑστεφάνωτο.

II. A. 156. Καρπὸν ἐδηλίσαντ' ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὰ μεταξύ.

Read, ἐπεὶ ἄρ μάλα πολλὰ μεταξύ.

The expression ἐπεὶ ἄρ occurs in II. Θ. 269. I. 409. P. 658. Ω. 42. 288; Od. A. 231. O. 389. P. 185. Υ. 86. Ψ. 258. In the same manner are to be altered, II. Δ. 56. 307. Θ. 144. 211. K. 557. Υ. 135. 368. 437. X. 40; Od. I. 276. K. 465. M. 109. II. 89. 442. P. 196. Φ. 154. X. 31.

DE DIFFERENTIA PROSÆ ET POETICÆ ORATIONIS DISPUTATIO

A GODOF. HERMANNO.

CICIODCCXCIV.

No. III.—[Continued from No. LXXIV.]

PARS II.

De elocutione.

(3) **D**ENIQUE ad elocutionem adgredimur. Nam quum orationis hæc sit natura, ut cogitata vocis auxilio significantur, non solum ea sunt in vocibus consideranda, quæ hominum arbitrio usuque ad cogitatorum rationem indicandam constituta sunt, (nam hæc etiam in alio signorum genere locum habitura essent,) sed illa etiam respicere convenit, quæ propria sunt vocis, neque ad argumentum et materiam cogitationum, sed ad vim spectant modumque, quo ad animi sensum accipiantur. Tanta enim inter cogitationes est vocemque necessitudo, ut non modo in sermonibus, quos audimus, convenientiam quamdam vocis et sententiarum requiramus, sed etiam in iis, quæ tacite legendo cognoscimus, si quid occurrat, quod ad vocis sonum in pronunciando aut ingratum esset aut insigniter suave futurum, statim aut offendamur, aut majorem in modum delectemur. Sunt autem hæc vocis conformationes, quas elocutionis nomine comprehendimus, quattuor generum. Primum genus pro ipsa sonorum natura constituitur: secundum in modulatione vocis positum est: tertium numeros complectitur: quartum denique ad assæ vocis et concentus discrimen spectat.

Ac primo, quod ad ipsam vocum naturam attinet, ejus duæ sunt formæ, una, quæ cantus vocatur, altera, quæ experts cantu est. (4) Harum sive quis diversam ad animos vim, sive eam, quæ ipsarum est conditio, spectet, cautum faveatur necesse est ad poesin, vocem quæ sine cantu est ad prosam orationem referendam esse. Apertum est enim, sine cantu eos loqui, qui cognosci aliquid ab aliis volunt: cantum autem ea esse vi præditum, ut unice ad suavitatem atque oblectationem factus videatur. Quin etiam ipsa vocis quæ est sine cantu, et ejus quæ cantus dicitur diversitas, qui sit utrusque finis, clare indicat. Nam, si quidem ego aliquid in hac re video, vocis, quæ non habet cantum, ea est ratio, ut sonos confusius, neque accurato et æquabili aëris pulsu distinctos proferrat. Quare quæ sic pronunciantur, in his satis habemus, si illa vocum discrimina notari possunt, quæ ad vocabulorum significationem et vim percipiendam audiri atque discerni necesse est. Id vero est ejus orationis, quæ ad cognitionem composita est: quæ quæ nihil curat aliud, nisi ut notitiæ rerum animo comprehendi

queant, omnem vim suam in eo expromit, ut has quam efficacissime mentibus insinuet. Aliter se res habet in cantu. Hic quoniam voces edidit æquabili aëris pulsu discretas, non tam ad id, quod vocibus significatur, animum subigit attendere, quam puritatem earum et discriminata certis proportionibus interstalla observare. Itaque, ut ipsa natura ad suavitatem factus, totus ad animi oblectationem adhibetur. Unde proprius est poeseos. Sed est hic nobis ad duas quæstiones respondendum. Nam etiamsi laud temere quisquam dubitabit, quin cantus ad poesin, vox cantu expers ad prosam orationem pertineat, erunt tamen fortasse, qui id usui magis et consuetudini, quam necessitati cuidam,tribuendum esse existiment. Ili igitur neque cur prosa oratio semper et ubique cantum adspernari, neque cur poesis non esse sine cantu debeat, intelligere sese fatebuntur. De utraque re nos aliter sentimus. Atque a prosa quidem oratione cantum abesse debere hoc facilius vicerimus, quod id vel suus quemque sensus docet. Cantus enim non est naturalis vox, sed arte composita, neque ad res significandas, sed ad pulcritudinem conformata, neque ad negotia vitæque apta, sed in lusu posita. Quare qui cantu uteretur ad hunc finem, (5) ut cogitata sua aliis nota redderet, is non solum alienum adhiberet adminiculum, quippe quod a cognitione rerum ad sensum pulcritudinis advocaret animos, sed etiam suo ipsius consilio repugnaret, qui rem seriam in ludum, veritatem in oblectationem, vitæ negotia in otiosam contemplationem verteret. Similis est poeseos sine cantu recitata ratio. Quamquam enim, si sententiæ, si dictio satis ad pulcritudinem elaboratæ sunt, cantus videtur omitti posse, præsertim quum etiam in iis carminibus, quæ facite legimus, absit: est tamen quædam non levis causa, quare eum in carminum recitatione necessarium judicemus. Etenim in pulcris artibus omnia, quæ carent pulcritudine, quum eam admittant, non solum non augent vim affectumque artium, sed, quia pulcritudo desideratur, turbant eum atque impediunt. Itaque quemadmodum poesis, a qua metrum abest, poesis quidem est, sed minus perfecta, quia pulcritudinem sententiarum dictionisque detractio pulcritudinis numerorum lædit, ita cantu omisso offensionem facit hoc, quod, quum cætera sint ad pulcritudinis sensum conformata, sola vox a fine poeseos recedat, et cognitionem magis quam voluptatem curare videatur. Hic quoque optima ad veritatem dux natura est. Una enim cum cantu orta poesis, cantoresque dicti primitus, qui postea, divisis artium officiis, discriminatim poetæ vocabantur.

Secundo loco in iis rebus, quibus prosa elocutio a poetica differt, modulationem vocis posuimus. Ea appellatione sic utimur, ut comparisonem syllabarum in quovis vocabulo, quam Græci vocant prosodiam, intelligamus. Atque hujus duæ sunt formæ. Nam in pronuntiandis vocabulis aut solam syllabarum mensuram notamus, aut præter mensuræ significationem etiam accentum adjicimus. Utra harum sit formarum ad poesin, utra ad prosam orationem accommodata, non potest obscurum esse. Accentus

Venim non modo hanc vim atque hunc usum habet, ut significatio-
nes vocabulorum discernat, et qua quidque potestate dicatur
indicet, sed etiam tali temperamento cum mensura confunditur,
ut severitatem mensuræ atque accuratam proportionem minuat.
(6) Itaque quum ex una parte ad cognitionem rerum atque intelligen-
tiam spectet, ex altera parte autem pulcritudine illa, quæ in men-
surarum aptis comparationibus est, careat, prosæ orationis, non
poeseos est. Mensura vero non solum quod accentu, qui verbo-
rum significationis demonstratio est, caret, sed etiam quia dura-
tionem sonorum certis proportionibus indicat, a cognitione eorum,
quæ verbis denotantur, ad ipsam vocis considerationem, et con-
templationem pulcritudinis, quæ est in justa temporis dimensione,
animos avocat. Inde propria poeseos ea pronuntiatio est, quæ
mensuram neglecto accentu exprimit. Confirmantur ea, quæ
diximus, experientia exemplisque linguarum. Ac Græcos quidem
Latinosque in prosa oratione accentum, in poesi solam mensuram
sequutos constat. Quorum de Latinis certior foret clariorque dis-
putatio, nisi in perpaucis tantum vocabulis accentus, quo in com-
muni sermone utebantur, vel e grammaticorum testimoniis notus
esset, vel probabili conjectura posset exputari. Ut exinde, de quo
Servii habemus auctoritatem, et infinitivi præteritorum activorum,
qui contractionem admittunt, ut *amavisse*, quorum accentum e
contractione divinare licet. In Græca vero lingua certa res est:
quæ simulatque in duas formas divisa est, poeticam et prosam,
prosa accentum conservavit, poetica plane rejecit. Antiquissimis
enim temporibus, nondum illo discrimine constituto, accentus
etiam in poesi aliquam dominationem habebat: quod in Homero
et Hesiodo plurimis potest et luculentissimis documentis cognosci.
Inde vero multe verborum conformationes, in quibus mensura
propter accentum neglecta esset, deinde ut legitimæ manserunt
atque in epicum sermonem receptæ sunt. De his in libro primo
de metris poetarum Græcorum et Romanorum explicatum est.
Eadem, quæ tum fuit Græcæ linguae ratio, nunc Germanicæ est.
Sequitur enim fere accentum etiam in poesi: sed veniet aliquando,
si recte auguror, tempus, quum certior mensura negligere accen-
tum, et poeticam quamdam pronuntiationem constituere docebit.
Initia certe hujus rei quædam videre jam nunc licet, ut apud
Klopstockium,

(7) *weisst du auch, Gleim, noch, wie, o undurstigster
von allen Sängern:*

quod ineptus foret, qui ob neglectum accentum reprehenderet.

Tertia prosæ et poeticæ elocutionis differentia posita est in nu-
meris. Atque hoc quidem in promptu est, neque indiget demon-
strationis, metrum poeseos esse, numerum metro solum prosæ
orationis. Sed quid sit, quo metrum ab oratoriis numeris differat,
nondum quisquam ex tot tamque præclaris rhetoricæ artis docto-
ribus satis videtur explariasse. Nam quæ e Græcis Aristoteles,
Demetrius, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Longinus, aliique, ex Ro-

manis autem inprimis Cicero et Quintilianus de hac re disputarunt, iis vereor ne perturbaverint magis hunc locum, quam expediverint. Depromant quædam ex his. Atque Aristotele. ita de numero oratorio scribit: τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως δεῖ μῆτε ἑμμετρον εἶναι, μῆτε ῥυθμον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπίθανον· πεπλάσθαι γὰρ δοκεῖ, καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐξίστησι· προσέχειν γὰρ ποιεῖ τῷ ὁμοίῳ πότε πάλιν ἦξει· τὸ δὲ ῥυθμον ἀπέραντον. δεῖ δὲ πεπεράνθαι μὲν, μὴ μέτρον δέ· ἀηδὲς γὰρ καὶ ἄγνωστον τὸ ἄπειρον. περαίνεται δὲ ἀριθμῷ πάντα· ὃ δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς λέξεως ἀριθμὸς ῥυθμὸς ἐστίν, οὗ καὶ τὰ μέτρα τμητά. διὸ ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μὴ· ποίημα γὰρ ἔσται ῥυθμὸν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται, ἕαν μὲχρι τοῦ ἦ. Apertum est, alia in his falsa, alia ambigua esse. Ac falsum est, quod metrum dicit illum esse numerum, qui recurrit. Hoc enim ut fiat in versibus heroicis, in anapæstis, in iambis, in carminibus antistrophicis, at num etiam in iis metris, quæ vocantur ἀπολελυμένα? In quibus quum versus omnes inter se sint dissimillimi, omnique repetitione numerorum destituti, oratorios existimare hos numeros, ex Aristotelis quidem sententia, non poeticos oportebit. Demde quam hoc est ambiguum, quod numeros oratorios esse quidem numeros, verum non plane, sed quadamtenus contendit. Id quidem ut velit intelligi, nusquam significavit. Mox vero alio modo sibi repugnat, ubi quum heroicos numeros, et iambicos, et trochaicos in prosa oratione improbasset, ita scribit: οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι διὰ τε τὰ εἰρημένα ἁφ' ἑτέροις, καὶ διότι μετρικοί. (8) ὃ δὲ παιὰν ληπτέος· ἀπὸ μόνου γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι μέτρον τῶν ῥηθέντων· ὥστε μάλιστα λανθάνειν. Atqui, ut pæonici neque sint dactylici, neque iambici, neque trochaici numeri, metrum tamen constituent, et quidem notissimum et usitatissimum, atque ex iis metris, quæ continua perpetuitate iterari solent. Quare Demosthenis illud, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις, comparatum est a Dionysio Halicarnassensi p. 238. cum hoc versu,

Κρηταῖος ἐν ῥυθμοῖς παῖδα μελψώμεθα.

Ita hic versus legendus videtur, non,

Κρηταῖος ἐν ῥυθμοῖς παῖδα μέλψωμεν.

Addit enim Dionysius, ἔξω γὰρ τοῦ τελευταίου ποδός, τὰ γε ἄλλα ἐν πᾶσιν ἴσα ὄρισται. Itaque si nota et usitata metra in prosa oratione vitanda sunt, laudatissimus ille Demosthenis locus non minus reprehendi debet, ac si versum heroicum admisisset. Fortasse tamen Aristoteles non voluit pedem pæonem primum vel quartum constanter servari, ut est in exemplis, quibus utitur,

χρυσεκκόμα ἔκατε, παῖ Διός,

μετὰ δὲ γὰν ὕδατ' ἡφάνισε νύξ,

sed mixtos inter se, ita ut in eodem membro uterque esset, usurpandos censuit. Ita certe mentem ejus cepisse videtur Demetrius sect. xxxviii. xxxix., qui hoc exemplum e Thucydide affert: ἤρξατο δὲ τὸ τακὸν ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας. Paullo propius verum accessisse videtur Longinus: quamquam hic quoque ita perplexe loquitur, ut magis obscure quodam sensu, quam clara intelligentia rem videatur comprehendisse. Demosthenis locus est hic: τοῦτο το

ὥς φησιμα τὸν τότε τῇ πόλει περιστάντα κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν.
 ὥσπερ νέφος. Iam Longinus sect. XXXIX. dactylicis numeris
 compositum dicit, de qua re nota est inepta disputatio Clarkii ad
 Iliad. ii. 537. Neque enim hoc voluit Longinus, solo pede dac-
 tylo hunc omnem locum decurrere, sed regnare in eo et primum
 esse dactylum, si quis non mensuram, sed pronunciationem accentu
 temperatam spectaret. (9) Quamquam, si ultima verba, ὥσπερ
 νέφος, pro Ionico a majore, ut videtur, habuit, falsus est simili
 errore, ac Dionysius Halicarnassensis, qui ubique, nulla accen-
 tus ratione habita, mensuras syllabarum respicit. Cujus ad
 exemplum si Thucydidis verba, quæ p. 136. affert, ita dimetiri
 aliquis velit, ἐπαινοῦ | σε τὸν προσ· | θεῖτα τῷ | νόμῳ τὸν | λόγον
 τὸν | &c. quis hic, obsecro, numerus erit? Neque rectius in hoc
 genere versatus est Cicero, qui in lib. iii. de oratore cap. 47. et 48.
 quum Aristotelis sententiam commemorasset, a pæonico numero
 exorsum dicit Fannium, si, *Quirites, minas illius*, qui quidem in
 prosa oratione non magis sunt numeri pæonici, atque hi sunt
 heroici, *urbem Romam a principio reges habere*. Sed Cicero
 quoque verum sensit, modo explicare scivisset. Nam ego, inquit,
*illud assentior Theophrasto, qui putat orationem, quæ quidem sit
 polita atque facta: quodammodo, non adstrictæ, sed venustius nu-
 merosam esse oportere*. Scilicet non est mirum, si artis rhetoricæ
 doctores, qui ad accentum non attenderent, prosæ orationis nume-
 ros a poeticis non potuerunt satis accurate distinguere. Poeticus
 numerus hic est, qui, neglecto accentu, mensuræ quibusdam va-
 rietatibus continetur. Hujus lex et ratio certis durationibus, cer-
 toque ordine sonorum comprehensa est. Neque is cognitioni, sed
 oblectationi, inservit: unde initia, fines, intercapedines non pro
 verborum atque orationis distinctionibus, sed pro ipsa mensurarum
 commoda distributione constitutas habet. Eaque ratio metrum
 vocatur. In prosa autem oratione numeri accentu reguntur, qui
 quum nec tollere plane syllabarum mensuram, neque ab ea ipse
 tolli possit, numeros ellicit e duplici numerorum genere, mensura
 accentuque, constantes, in quibus potiorum locum accentus, se-
 cundarium mensura tenet. Itaque inimpuncta mensuræ severitate,
 unde oratorium numerum Cicero remissorem, Aristoteles ῥυθμὸν
 μέχρι τοῦ vocat, quod de pulcritudine metrici numeri detrahatur,
 rependit vis accentuum, aucta vocabulorum significationis potes-
 tate, et eo decursu verborum instituto, qui ad sententiæ intelli-
 gentiam est potentissimus. Quamobrem distinctiones non habet alias,
 nisi quæ orationis quoque divisiones sunt. Ita jam explicare licebit
 Longini de illo Demosthenis loco sententiam, (10) in qua etiam
 Klopstockius a vero aberravit. Nimirum dactylici sunt isti numeri
 maximam partem, si quidem metricorum numerorum nominibus in
 hoc genere uti licet: τοῦτο τὸ | ψήφισμα | τὸν τότε τῇ | πόλει | περι-
 στάντα | κίνδυνον | παρελθεῖν ἐ | ποιήσεν | ὥσπερ | νέφος. Indica-
 bo horum rationem numerorum iis signis, quibus in metrica arte
 utimur, sed accentu prosæ orationis, non metrico, notato:

$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}$

Ita hæc, *si, Quirites, minas illius, hunc habent numerum* :

$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}$

et hæc, *urbem Romam a principio reges habuere, hunc* :

$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}$

Propemodum intelligi ex his potest, quid sibi velit illud, quod in prosa oratione verba ita collocari vetant, ut aut integri versus, aut partes certe versuum nasci videantur. Primum enim hoc non nisi de usitatissimis metris accipiendum est, quæ quoniam ita sunt posita, ut neminem lateant, non sunt propterea vitanda, quia numeri isti ad prosam orationem non sint apti, sed quod ob frequentem in poesi usum etiam cogunt auditorem poeseos recordari. Deinde vero sic tantum vitiosi sunt hi numeri, si etiam consentiente accentu poetici sunt. Nam si accentus facit, ut ne audiri quidem metrum, quod in mensura syllabarum est, possit, quemadmodum in isto Fannii exordio, vel Taciti, aut hoc T. Lavi. *facturusne opera pretium sim*, ita metrum et numeri poetici occultantur, ut vix tenuissima eorum vestigia maneant. Quodsi etiam accentus ad poeticos numeros ducit, ut in illo Ciceronis de oratore i. 10. *instaret Academia, quæ, quidquid dixisset, id te ipsum scire negaret*, ea negligentia scriptoris est, non satis a poeseos contagione sibi caventis. Cæterum uterque numerus suas habet leges, (11 non sane quod ad vim et pulchritudinem attinet, etiam hæc utriusque communes sunt,) sed si vocabulorum conditionem, orationis complexiones, usum denique et consuetudinem spectes. Ut in quibusdam versibus, maxime in anapæstis, nihil offensionis habent plura contigua verba ejusdem longitudinis et mensuræ :

φρούδας πρέσβους, φρούδας παῖδες.

In prosa autem oratione si plura verba parem et longitudinem et accentum habentia continuantur, ut hæc ipsa Euripidis, intolerabilia sunt, præsertim in fine sententiæ. Quare ibi si ponuntur, videndum, ut vim quamdam hic numerus habeat, quæ non est in aliis numeris. Ut in Demosthenico illo, *ὥσπερ νέφος*. Id recte observat Longinus nusquam potuisse melius, quam in fine, collocari; nec perinde esse, utrum *ὡς νέφος*, vel *ὥσπερ τὸ νέφος* dicatur. Ex his numeris melior certe esset hic, *ὥσπερ τὸ νέφος*, quia etiam in antispastico exitu aliquod robur esset; multo deterior alter, *ὡς νέφος*, qui pæne ad mollitiem amphibrachi accedit. Sed fortissimus omnium is est, quo usus est Demosthenes, ut asperrimus maximeque præruptus. Similis fere ratio in verborum complexionibus obtinet, in quibus cavendum, ne vel inter se nimis sint similes, vel membrorum pari conformatione lectorem defatigent. Contra in poesi hæc similitudo numerorum sive in membris periodorum, sive in ipsis periculis fere legitima est. Porro numeri oratorii lex est, ne

ultra spiritum et latera producat: eaque lex ad periodos earumque membra spectat. In poesi eadem sane, sed tantum in versuum longitudine, non etiam in complexionibus verborum, lex est. Denique usus et in oratoriis numeris et in poeticis, non ille quidem temere, sed ob aliquam virtutem numerorum, certas quasdam consuetudines stabilivit. De qua re in oratoriis numeris perobscura quæstio est, maximeque indigens vivæ atque in ore hominum versantis linguæ. Certiores poeticorum sunt numerorum consuetudines. Hi enim quia multo minorem habent, quam prosæ orationis numeri, varietatem, eamque ipsam certa ratione in quædam genera divisam, (12) aliquanto facilius poterit, qui aurem lectione poetarum adsuefecerit, usitata ab insolentibus, ea quæ potuerint usurpari ab iis quæ non potuerint, discernere. Quod qui fecerit, negabit is, puto, huiusmodi versum a quoque tragico factum:

τὰς δυστάνου Κολχίδος,

nedum ut reponat usquam. Alia huiusmodi exempla in chori carmine, quod est in Euripidis Oreste v. 310. seqq. reperiuntur. Ejusdem generis quædam versuum cæsurae sunt. Ut in illo Æschyli,

καὶ μὴν φίλοις ἔλεινός εισορᾶν ἰγώ.

etiamsi ita legatur,

καὶ μὴν φίλοις ἔλεινός εισορᾶν ἰγώ.

erit tamen quod usitatam cæsura esse neglectam mireris. Quanto enim elegantius scripsisset,

καὶ μὴν ἔλεινός εισορᾶν φίλοις ἰγώ.

Cur ergo non hoc reponimus? Scilicet prætenditur cæsura, quæ vocatur *ὑποθημερής*, multum illa, ut putant, usitata. Atqui si hæc cæsura ne est quidem omnino cæsura, quid tum? Equidem certe Æschylum, quum posset legitimam cæsura levissima ordinis verborum mutatione consequi, non arbitror id cum non fuisse facturum. Verum, nisi fallor, alio modo cæsura illam conservavit. Nam quum in duobus codicibus *φίλοισιν* legatur, ita eum scripsisse veri simillimum est:

καὶ μὴν φίλοισιν οἰκτρὸς εισορᾶν ἰγώ.

Sed satis dictum de numeris. Reliquum est, ut de ultima prosæ et poeticæ elocutionis differentia explicetur. Ea vero posita est in vi, quam vox pro diversis prosæ et poeticæ orationis fimbriis ad animos hominum habet. Ac quoniam prosæ orationis hic est finis, ut rerum cognitionem atque intelligentiam afferat, id in primis curari in elocutione debet, ut clara sit vox atque distincta. (13) Poesis autem quum ad sensum pulchritudinis referatur, atque ipsa quoque elocutione animos commovere studeat, operam dare poterit, ut, etiam si nonnihil impediatur sententiarum intelligentia, vox tamen quantum potest plena, sonora, grandis, coagmentata, et pene tumultuosa ad aurem accedat. Quamobrem prosa oratio assam

vocem requirit, quam non modo sic intelligimus, ut symphonia musicorum instrumentorum, sed etiam ut aliarum vocum concentus absit. Confunduntur enim conjunctæ voces, neque exaudiri satis cognoscique id, quod quis loquitur, sinunt. Poesis vero, quæ non ad cognitionem, sed ad oblectationem apta est, ac sæpe cognita jam et omnibus nota canitur, densatis vocibus et symphonia confectam vim in animos hominum effundit.

Sed hæc hactenus. Venio nunc ad id, cujus causa hæc altera pars disputationis de prosæ et poeticæ orationis differentia in lucem emissa est. Indicenda est enim litteratis hujus urbis civibus in diem XII. Martii solemnitas publicæ orationis, qua demandatum nuper mihi munus Ordinariæ Professionis Eloquentiæ auspiciaturus sum. Cujus muneris ratio quum, his præsertim temporibus, hoc maxime a me videatur exigere, ut studia antiquarum litterarum, nimis illa jam contemni cœpta, pro virili parte tueri, suumque iis honorem conservare adjuvet oratione illa, quid hoc sit, litteras humaniores colere, quamque vim habeat, conabor ostendere. Sed præter hæc, quæ ipsius muneris causa mihi dicenda puto, etiam gratias agere oportet iis, quorum id consilio et patrocinio consequutus sum. Ac sive ipsum beneficium respiciam, muneris dignitas, officii gravitas, honoris amplitudo largissimam gratulandi materiam præbent; sive eorum, a quibus tributum est, recorder, FRIDERICI AUGUSTI, Serenissimi Principis, (II) clementia, sapientissimorum ejus amicorum auctoritas, amplissimi ordinis philosophorum gratia et commendatio, aliorum denique summorum virorum studium ac voluntas, ita mihi et exoptata et cumulata contigerunt, ut nihil neque ad pietatem sanctius, neque ad animi sensum antiquius gratiis agendis habere me posse arbitrer. Quo magis, ut RECTOR ACADEMIÆ MAGNIFICUS, PRINCIPES CELSISSIMI, COMITES ILLUSTRISSIMI, GRAVISSIMI UTRIUSQUE REIPUBLICÆ PROCERES, NOBILISSIMI ET HUMANISSIMI COMMILITONES hanc orationem nostram præsentia sua et frequentia celebrem reddere velint, qua pietate quoque studio decet, rogamus.

Athenian Elegance delineated; or, a Critical Inquiry into the Principles and Laws of the Grecian Tragic Poetry.

No. III.—[Concluded from No. LXXIV.]

THE position of the anapæst must now engage our attention. It is altogether needless to remark, that the admission of this foot into the fifth place of an iambic trimeter, is not, in the present

state of philology, countenanced by any critic whatever; such an usage would be utterly destructive of the proper character of the concluding dipodæ. But in the extensive field of classical discussion, there is no one point that has been more controverted, than whether an anapæst may or may not be employed as the third foot of the verse. On this side we can rank all the most eminent metrical critics, besides a host of less eminent though respectable philologists; but although their opponents are accumulating daily, the few advocates of its admission have not yet resigned the contest. Repeatedly vanquished on the ground of classic authority, they have advanced with unflinching ardor to attack the less guarded position of the usage in question injuring the metrical beauty; nor have they altogether failed of success. Indeed the arguments employed in the defence of this point are quite feeble and inadequate, forming a striking contrast to those which affect the practice of the tragedians. The remark of Maltby is, "Memini quendam amicum olim a me petiisse, an apud Sophoclem anapæstus in tertia sede possit inveniri, aut dactylus in quinta: cui responsum dedi; prius rarissime, et ob hanc causam, quia anapæstus in tertia sede cæsuram, sive comma, quo versus debet dividi, pessum daret, et exinde versum redderet *δυσμυρον*. Morell. Huc respexit Porsonus, Præf. ad Hec. not. p. 5." But the assertion of Morell requires the aid of the position, "this dividing cæsure was never neglected by the tragedians of Athens," to attain the rank of an argument. Standing, however, on the principles we advanced, whilst considering the position of the dactyl, the exclusion of the anapæst from the third place of the senarius, may be proved almost beyond the possibility of a doubt. The same regard for the preservation of the iambic character of the verse, that dictated such restrictions on the dactyl used as the third foot, (restrictions depriving it in a manner of its importance as a dactyl,) rendered it necessary that the anapæst should either be submitted to similar restrictions, or forfeit all claim to the third place of the line. But the nature of the anapæst $\cup \cup \text{—}$, so widely different from the dactyl $\text{—} \cup \cup$, made it impossible to impose any regulation of the tendency referred to; and thus it became incumbent on the poet to exclude it altogether from that part of the verse. To enter more deeply into the subject will be unnecessary, while Porson's preface to the *Hecuba* of Euripides, and the supplement to that preface, are so extensively known and so highly valued. We shall, accordingly, content ourselves with noticing the exception in favor of a proper name. It is universally allowed, that when the insertion of a proper name became necessary, (the insertion of which necessarily implied the introduction of an anapæst in one of the middle four places, or the violation of some regulation, equal in importance to that which confines the anapæst to the first place,) it was lawful to introduce this foot as the second, third, fourth, or fifth of the verse, though the preference was, in our judgment,

given to the third place. Porson is further of opinion, that not only was a concession made to the anapaest in this case, but that likewise the same liberty was occasionally claimed in reference to proper names, where no case of *utter necessity* could be proved. In this particular, he appears to be virulently opposed by many critics, who admire and support his observations and reasonings on the subject of the anapaest in *tertia sede*. Among them, Erfurdt has the following note on the 794th verse of the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles: "Hermannii correctionem exhibui ad Eurip. Hec. p. 62. propositam. In vulgata lectione præter malos numeros offendit inepta orationis forma, Ἀγάμεμνον ὦ Μενέλαε. Quasi quid sit, quod Menelaum magis quam Agamemnonem abominetur Philoctetes. Anapaesto versum contaminanti male patrocinatur Porsonus in Suppl. ad præf. Hecub. p. 23. Nam simile nostro loco exemplum in Æschylo nullum, in Sophocle nonnisi unum exstat Aj. v. 1008. idque jam a Toupio bene emendatum. Euripideorum nulla est habenda ratio." The verse of the *Philoctetes* is,

Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε, πῶς ἂν αὐτ' ἐμοῦ.

and the emendation of Hermann,

Πῶς ἂν, Ἀγάμεμνον, καὶ Μενέλαω, αὐτ' ἐμοῦ.

With regard to the verse of the *Ajax*, we do not advocate the correctness of the present reading; indeed we fully acquiesce in the opinion of Toup, supported as it is by authorities. But the difficulty arising from this line is not to be so easily evaded as the opponents of Porson would wish. The *passage* has evidently suffered by transcription, but the corrections hitherto proposed are almost a sufficient proof of the truth of the present lection of this *line*. Respecting the emendation of Hermann, we think it enough to say, that it is not such as to recommend itself to the adoption of philologists. The remark of Duabar is in point: "Hæc (correctio) ferenda erat, si quidem nihil antea fuerat quod ad se traheret nomen Agamemnonis et Menelai. Sed, meo iudicio, ὦ διπλοῖ στρατηλάται, non sinit ut Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε, quæ est vulgaris lectio, a se, interrogativis verbis πῶς ἂν separaretur: ὦ certe ante Μενέλαε offendit." Lectionem, quam dedi, probabiliorẽ iudico, scilicet.

Πῶς Ἀγάμεμνον, καὶ Μενέλαω, ἂν τονγ' ἐμοί."

We regret that the critical sagacity of the learned Professor merely detected the errors of others, without satisfactorily correcting them. The reading he has adopted is, unless we are greatly deceived, liable, though not in the same degree, to the objection he has advanced to that of Erfurdt. Besides, we do most earnestly maintain, that a short vowel cannot, on any principle remain short before the consonants *μν*; and that a spondee is not to be tolerated in any of the 'even' places, except in a case of absolute necessity, or of urgent expedience; neither of which is presented in the verse in question. Erfurdt indeed, in his anno-

tations on the 1077th verse of the Ajax, takes occasion to notice an assertion of Brunck, viz. "that the tragedians of Athens invariably lengthened a short vowel before κ , π , μ , σ , σ ; and observes, that with regard to μ , the rule should be considered of general not of universal application: but the passages he adduces to confirm his sentiments, either present cases of urgent expedience, or nullify his argument by their corruptions. After these remarks, any emendation we may offer will be doubtless regarded with an eye of suspicion, and scrutinized to the very bottom. Aware of the disadvantage under which we thus labor, we should shrink from the task, but that the circumstances which expose us to these difficulties, imperatively call on us to face them with resolution. Casting ourselves then on the candor of our readers, we proceed to inquire a little further into the passage. The sentence, according to Mss., is,

$\tilde{\omega}$ διπλοῖ στρατηλάται,
'Αγάμεμνον, $\tilde{\omega}$ Μενέλαε, πῶς ἂν ἄντ' ἐμοῦ
Τὸν ἴσον χρόνον τρέψετε τήνδε τὴν ἰσσαν;

Now it cannot admit of dispute, that, as the sentence now stands, the vocative interjection $\tilde{\omega}$ before Μενέλαε is altogether inappropriate; and it is equally evident, that either a particle synonymous with καὶ originally joined the two proper names, or the words διπλοῖ στρατηλάται have been a little modified by transcribers, and had in the first instance an individual application to 'Αγάμεμνον. The former hypothesis is the ground of the corrections already discussed; and we cannot on this hypothesis furnish any satisfactory emendation. The following may to some wear an appearance of probability:

'Αγάμεμνον ἠδὲ Μενέλαως, ἂν ἄντ' ἐμοῦ

in which case the sentence will be terminated by a period, not a note of interrogation; but to this correction there are many objections of weight. The latter method has never yet, to our knowledge, been tried; but for our own part, we consider that the path it discovers to us is, if properly pursued, more likely to lead to the right conclusion than the beaten track. Let it be observed then, that Sophocles, when speaking of Agamemnon and Menelaus as united in command, usually employs the word διπλοῖ not διπλοῖ, (see vss. 264. 1024. Aj. 57.) and with propriety; that exactly corresponding to the Latin term 'gemini,' whilst this may be accurately translated 'duplices.' Yea, we question whether the epithet διπλοῖ is strictly applicable to the case of two persons conjointly engaged in any office. In the second place, not only does the word διπλοῖ answer pretty nearly to the English 'double,' but in many passages it is to be rendered 'versutus,' 'crafty' or 'subtile'; a meaning which the *duplex* of the Romans occasionally bears. From these considerations we have been led to conjecture,

ὦ διπλοῦ στρατηλάτα
 Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε, πῶς ἂν ἀντ' ἐμῷ
 ὄν' ἴσον χρόνον τρέφοιτε τήνδε τὴν νόσον;

The triumphant and impassioned inquiry, "how would ye bear up under this disease," (words far from being adequate to convey the force of the original,) well corresponds to the taunt of superficial qualities contained in the epithet διπλοῦ. The view this lection takes of the relative power of Agamemnon and Menelaus, is abundantly justified by Aj. 1386, 7: in short, it is, beyond all comparison, more elegant than any that have passed under our revision; and it acquires not a little degree of probability from the circumstance, that supposing it to be the true reading, the corruption of the passage is not difficult to be accounted for. We have enlarged in our remarks, in order to show that there is one verse, at the least, in the writings of Sophocles, that cannot be wrested to confirm the sentiments of Eufurdt, according to which, the admission of an anapaest is not to be tolerated in any but the first place of the verse, unless in a case of *utter necessity*. But even conceding the position, that in the extant works of Aeschylus and Sophocles there is not a single verse to be found in support of Porson's theory, the gratuitous affirmation of Eufurdt, "*Euripideorum nulla est habenda ratio*," amounts nearly to a refutation of the doctrine which requires such an assertion. But this is not all that can be urged on that side of the question we advocate: the fact is, that although the word Μενέλαε can be used in a senarius without incurring the introduction of an anapaest, and although the term Μενέλεως can be employed with propriety, yet in the passage we have considered, neither object could have been effected without material injury to the sense; and thus the introduction of the anapaest stands on the basis, not indeed of utter necessity, but of what is next in firmness and stability, pressing expedience. So with other verses. It may be that this was not the idea of Porson; indeed from the limitation he afterwards makes of his remark, to the case when the anapaest is in *one* proper name, we may conclude that such was not the sentiment entertained by the great English professor; but farther than the above principle warrants, we dare not extend the liberty in question, nor can we subscribe to any minor regulation, which goes to limit the application of that principle.

We must now pass on to notice the anapaest used as the first foot of an iambic trimeter. That it has a title to this position, cannot be questioned: the only point to which attention must be paid, is, whether it occupies it under any restrictions. In the extant productions of the Attic tragedians, there are, it must be confessed, but comparatively few passages, in which the anapaest in *prima sede* is contained in more than one word; and Hermann, observing this peculiarity of usage, has conjectured it to have

been a standing law of the tragic senarii, that the anapæst so situated should be either comprehended in a single word, or divided between a preposition and the noun it governs. We copy the following extract from Maltby's *prosody*: "Atque in primo loco, in quo frequentissimus est anapæstus, hæc lex obtinet, ut istæ syllabæ, e quibus constat anapæstus, omnes ejusdem vocabuli sint.' Hermann. Præf. in *Hecub.* p. 53. 'Exceptio, si qua est, in præpositionis usu posita videtur. Nam quum præpositio plerumque necessario ante id nomen, quod regit, collocari debeat, prope modum præpositio cum nomine conjuncta unius verbi vice fungitur. Ejusmodi exempla solus Euripides suppeditat.' *Ib.* p. 56. Sed vide *Heraclid.* vss. 91. 1017."

In the sentiments of Hermann we cannot fully coincide; his remarks, though founded in truth, are by no means sufficiently precise or correct. How can it, we ask, affect the recitation of the verse, to have the anapæst in *prima sede*, comprehended in one word, or distributed between more than one? Let us attend to the point a little more closely, and we shall soon perceive that the usage in question merely illustrates the observance, that the anapæst was never employed as the first foot, except when any other arrangement would have, in a degree, rendered the verse less expressive, or have induced a still greater impropriety in its metrical construction. When a word is $\cup\cup-$, the last syllable being long by nature, (and this is the most usual form of an anapæst constituting a word,) it is evident that it can only be introduced into a senarius, either as an anapæst, or the first two syllables being the last of a tribrach in the second or fourth places, and the last as the first of a dactyl or spondee in the third, or a spondee in the fifth place; a collocation often impracticable, and still oftener injurious. Similar is the case when a word commences $\cup\cup-$; and even when a word is of itself $\cup\cup\cup$, circumstances may arise which may render the admission of an anapæst in the first place preferable to any other mode of distribution. In the detail of our sentiments on this head, it is necessary to be very particular, the subject being, in a measure, complicated and abstruse. Hermann then remarks, that the anapæst in the first place is always contained in one word, but allows that in the works of Euripides it is occasionally composed of a preposition, and the word or part of the word that it governs: he considers farther, that this regulation was in force as of itself influencing the beauty of the verse. We, on the other hand, do maintain, that contemplated as observed for its own sake, the usage is altogether inexplicable; and accordingly, without receiving it as a rule, regard it as furnishing instances of a more general observance. And although to attend to the observance for which we contend, is, in most cases, to follow the rule of Hermann, yet there are passages in which the observance excuses what the rule condemns, and condemns what the rule excuses.

The following line of the *Prometheus Vinc-tus* of Æschylus comes under the latter observation,—the only verse of the kind, amongst all those in the eleven tragedies already named, in accordance with the regulation of Hermann :

Ποταμῶν τε πῆγαι, ποταμῶν τε κυμάτων, v. 89.

With equal beauty and strength of expression may it be said, .

Πῆγαι τε ποταμῶν, ποταμῶν τε κυμάτων,

especially when taken in connexion with the succeeding verse : and these were undoubtedly the words of Æschylus.

Let us now advert for a moment to the position of the tribrach. It may be observed in the first place, that this foot, from its peculiar character ∪ ∪ ∪, is calculated to give by its occasional introduction in the scæni, an admirable variety to the recitation, at once simple, easy, and elegant. Not so when two tribrachs follow each other, the concurrence of so many short syllables not being too consistent with the iambic character, or the unassuming dignity of the verse ; and thus, instances of such a collocation are extremely rare, and whenever they do occur, the tribrachs are in the former part of the line. Besides, two consecutive tribrachs cannot, unless we are greatly deceived, be uttered with propriety without an intervening vocal pause ; and accordingly, when the objectionable usage was adopted, the feet were so placed as to admit, agreeably to our system of recitation, of one of the metrical pauses between them. We venture to affirm, that not one single passage, possessing any great claim to correctness, can be adduced to show that they are admissible beyond these limits. The 1420th verse of the *Philoctetes*, which is, according to Mss.,

Ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν ἔσχω, ὡς πάρεσθ' ὄρεϊν,

has indeed occasioned critics no little trouble, as will be seen from the following note of Erfurdt : —“ἀρετὴν dupliciter offendit primum ob ictum in prima syllaba male collocatum, dem quia sequentibus parum videtur aptum esse. Quippe requiritur vox, qua exprimatur, quod sub adspæctum venire possit. E priore Hermannii conjectura, dedi Ἀθάνατον ἀλκὴν. Priorem dico, quandoquidem in Notis Mstis hæc monuit : “Ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν vitiosum esse, et sensus, et Euripidei numeri arguunt. Certius etiam affirmaverim, ἀλκὴν non esse Sophocleum, quo ut numeri corrigantur, sensui tamen male prospicitur. Sæpe major laus est annuadventis vitia, quam corrigentis ; certe tutior. Sed, si tamen seire cupis quid suspicer, vereor ne istud ἀρετὴν ex interpretatione δι' ἀρετὴν ortum sit. Sensus loci tale quid requirit :

Ἀθάνατον αἰθέρ' ἔσχω, ὡς πάρεσθ' ὄρεϊν.

Hæc arte Pollux et vagus Hercules

Ensis arces attigit igneas.

eis Ἀθάνατον αἰθέρ' ἐμπεσὼν dicit Eurip. *Hel.* 1022.” Schæfer appears silently to have retained the vulgar reading ; and Dunbar, without any original remarks, adopts the correction* of Hermann

approved of by Erfurdt. For our own part, we cannot concur in either of the emendations proposed, being decidedly of opinion, that they considerably impair the sentiment which the poet intended to convey. The phrase objected to by Hermann and Erfurdt has been correctly translated by Musgrave, 'immortale decus.' Without altering the expression we would write,

Ἀρετὴν ἀθάνατον ἔσχατον, ὡς πάρεσθ' ὄρεον.

And this reading, whilst it proceeds on a simple principle, is sufficiently justified from the charge of metrical impropriety, by our concluding observations on the position of the anapaest. Whilst we highly respect its author, we cannot but regard as puerile that sentence of Erfurdt, in his note on the 818th verse of the *Electra* of Sophocles, "Anapaestum iambico versui ex emendatione inferre, etiam ab initio versus, religiosum est." We recur to our motto, a beautiful motto, and one that does credit to the mind of Hermann:—"Omnino causae prius investigandae sunt, quam regule constituendae."

It must be remarked, secondly, that a tribrach never occupies the fourth place of the line, when a dactyl occurs in the third. Such a collocation is entirely inconsistent with that regard for the preservation of the iambic character of the verse, which we have shown influenced the tragedian of Athens in adopting many of his regulations, and imposing many of his restrictions. Neither are we aware, that any classical authority of moment can be adduced in support of it: in those eleven plays, at the least, which we have more particularly examined, there is only one passage that can afford it the slightest countenance. We allude to the 1096th and 1097th verses of the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles, of which the following lection prevails throughout our editions:

Διφυή τ' ἄμικτον ἱπποδάμοια στρατὸν

Θηρῶν, ὑβριστὴν, ἄνομον, ὑπέροχον βίαν.

The Mss. have without exception *ὑπέροχα*, a circumstance in our judgment rendering the present reading highly suspicious. Now, if we mistake not, the epithet *ἄνομον* is totally unnecessary, and bears some indications of having been originally a gloss on the preceding one, *ὑβριστὴν*. The present position of *ἄμικτον*, moreover, appears to us altogether unsuitable; in short, admitting the correctness of the vulgar reading, the verses are utterly devoid of sentential or metrical beauty, far different from those with which they are associated. We have been led, from the considerations enumerated, to adopt the following correction;

Διφυή τε θηρῶν ἱπποδάμοια στρατὸν

"Ἀμικτον ὑβριστὴν ὑπέροχον βίαν,

the antepenultimate of *ὑπέροχον* being lengthened by the ictus metricus.—After a dactyl in the first place, the tribrach may occasionally be introduced, with the proviso, however, that a pause is to be made after the first syllable of the dactyl, and, as a neces-

sary consequence, that no pause is to be made after that foot. See Ajac. 854. Phil. 796.

In treating of the position of the spondee, it is requisite to notice briefly the reason of the general rule, viz. that this foot may occupy any or all of the places of an iambic trimeter denoted by the odd numbers, the first, the third, and the fifth, but cannot be allowed in the second, fourth, or sixth. Every principle of metrical consistency rendered it necessary, that the last foot of a senarius should be an iamb; and this point being established, it will be easy to perceive, that by no other method could the systems of senarii be varied with so great beauty and propriety. But the only thing of consequence to which lengthened attention must be given, whilst examining this branch of our subject, is the '*pausa*' of Porson; the doctrine of the learned professor containing the only exception to the general rule, or rather, the only additional restriction on the use of the spondee, that can be defended by any thing like argument, or derive the least support from the classic writings. Porson observes, "Hanc regulam plerumque in senariis observabant tragici, ut si voce, quæ creticum pedem elliceret, terminaretur versus, eamque vocem hypermonosyllabon præcederet, quintus pes iambus vel tribrachys, esse deberet. Non potuerunt igitur talem versum tragici scribere, qualis est,

Κρύπτοντα χεῖρα καὶ πρόσωπον τοῖμπαλιν,

certe noluere, si modo vel diversa orthographica, vel alia verborum positura vitare possent, *In secum missos magno cum pondere versus*. Res eadem est, si creticus in trocheum et syllabam dissolvitur: vel si cretico in syllabam longam et iambum dissoluto, syllaba longa est aut articulus aut præpositio, aut quævis denique vox, quæ ad sequentia potius quam præcedentia pertineat. Verum si secunda quinti pedis pars ejus sit generis, ut præcedenti verbo adhæreat, et ambo quasi unam vocem simul efficiant, non jam amplius necesse erit, ut verbum præcedens brevi syllaba terminetur." The natural inquiry, which a careful perusal of these remarks is calculated to suggest, is, on what principle can the rule be justified? The quotation from Horace is of a general nature and a general application, and has no distinct, particular reference to the subject under consideration. Thus the task devolves on us, to develope the reasons which induced the tragedians of ancient Greece to adopt the regulation, in most if not all of its branches. In the first case specified by Porson, supposing that the spondee was admitted as the fifth foot, the conclusion of the verse would be $\varepsilon\{-\cup\cup\cup$. This is also the case when, as Porson expresses it, the cretic is divided into a trochee and a final syllable; and likewise in the third instance specified, the intimate connexion between the two words constituting the syllable and the iamb, rendering the occurrence of the less metrical pause after the former improper. Now not only was it incumbent on the

poet to preserve in the concluding dipode, the proper character, so to speak, of the verse, as far as could be done consistently with the proper variety; but it was requisite likewise, that this most important part of the line should be characterised by that species of dignity, attainable by the occurrence of the metrical pauses. On these grounds the most approved terminations are,

[illegible]

terminations beautifully interspersed in the tragic writings of the Athenian dramatists. The termination ' | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ was less approved, and still less the one under consideration ' | - ˘ ˘ ˘ ; and of this last, if not of both, may it be said, that whenever it could be done without weakening the sense, or incurring a greater violation of metrical beauty, it was excluded from the iambic trimeters of Grecian tragedy. On these principles we also disapprove of the terminations ' ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ , ' ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ; of the latter especially, of which, as far as our recollection extends, there is not a single instance in the extant tragedies. We are not a little surprised that Porson could say, " si voce, quæ cretæum pedem efficeret, terminaretur versus, eamque vocem hypermonosyllabon præcederet, quantus pes iambus vel tribrachys esse debet : " it being impossible to make the fifth foot a tribrach, when the concluding word is a cretic - ˘ - : indeed, it is in our judgment most probable, that Porson's words have been in this particular misprinted. As a critic, Porson is ever to be admired and respected ; and had we been able to discover any consistent principle affecting the usages specified in the rule we are considering, in addition to those already mentioned, especially if it had served to recommend the rule precisely as given by the great professor, that principle should have had, on our part, its due degree of consideration. But this has not been the case ; and as we are studious on the one hand to acquiesce in no regulation for which no satisfactory or sufficient reason can be assigned, and on the other to give every principle its proper latitude, we must adopt as correct a regulation, or more properly an observance, in many respects coinciding with, but in as many differing from, that embracing the doctrine of the ' pausa.' And the sentiment we entertain on this subject is not a little recommended by its conveniency for practice ; for although there are verses, (see for instance, (Ed. Tyr. 3. 19. 327. 339.) in which the termination we object to occurs, without involving a violation of Porson's rule, yet most if not all of these, and numerous others condemned by the ' pausa,' of which no satisfactory correction could be offered, may be referred with propriety to the excusing clause of our remark.

HAVING thus endeavored to furnish our readers, with the regula-
VOL. XXXVIII. CL. II. NO. LXXV. D

tions by which the use of several feet admissible in the iambic senarius was restricted, and the principles on which those regulations were formed, we must, in the next place, advert to the other restrictions to which the Tragic poet submitted from a regard to euphony. We commence with two remarks of Professor Porson; the former, that the third and fourth feet are seldom found as in the following verses:

Μενέλαε, μὴ γνῶμας ὑποστήσας σοφάας,
Θρήκην περάσαντες μόλις πολλῶ πόνῳ.

the latter, that the third and fourth feet were never united in one word. With regard to the first observation, the only principle on which the restriction it contains can be justified, is, that any pause in the middle of the verse was disapproved of by Athenian refinement; a principle in itself extremely probable, and, together with the remark founded on it, rendered indubitable by classic usage. The collocation proscribed by the second, is equally if not more objectionable, provided the third and fourth feet constitute one word, as in the subjoined line;

Ἡ κάρ' ἂρ' ἄν | παρεσκόπει | χρησμῶν ἐμῶν.

in which, however, the intimate connexion between the verb and preceding particle, renders it necessary, that the less metrical pause should be made after the first dipode, instead of the greater. Except in cases similar to this, when the collocation referred to takes place, the greater metrical pause occurs at the end both of the first and the second dipode, a circumstance which manifestly occasions no very poetic sound to the verse. But we cannot go so far as to exclude even this arrangement of the words, under *all circumstances*, from the senarius: respecting it and that previously noticed, we consider it more safe and more consistent to say, that they are very seldom to be met with in the extant works of the standard tragedians, and that it does not appear that they were resorted to, unless in cases of peculiar expedience. These two rules, thus qualified, contain all that is requisite to be advanced in the shape of rules, concerning the arrangement of words and feet, —in other words, the distribution of the metrical pauses. In this particular there is a beautiful variety throughout the compositions of the Attic tragedians; and although some collocations occur far more frequently than others, being intrinsically of superior beauty, yet no arrangement unless absolutely unharmonious, and irreconcilable with the character of the verse, was altogether excluded. It may, notwithstanding, be requisite to notice before we proceed, the following paragraph taken from the observations of Hermann on the iambic trimeter of the tragedians, in his work on the Science of Metres. “Porsonum sequutus censor editionis meæ Supplicum Euripidis in Diario Classico (*Classical Journal*,) tom. 16. p. 428 sqq. dum in res fortuitas parvique momenti intentus erat, regulam proposuit hanc, ubi tertius pes tragici senarii una voce contingeretur, simulque versus dividi posset in duas partes

æquales, plerumque alteram versus partem aut elisionem ante se habere, aut vocabulo incipere, quod orationem inchoare non posset, veluti *ἄχ, γάρ, δέ, μέν*, omninoque dictionibus encliticis; eamque regulam non solum ad eos versus spectare, in quibus tertius pes vel integro vocabulo, vel parte longioris vocabulo impleretur, sed etiam in quibus illud vocabulum ex duobus in unum coniungi solitis constaret, qualia sunt *δήπον, εἶπερ, εἷς*, &c. Non facile, inquit, intelligi, cur magis placuerit auribus Atheniensium,

Εἰς τὰσδε γὰρ βλέψας | ἐπηνεζάμην τάδε,

Κεῖνη γὰρ ὤλεσέν | νιν, εἰς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει,

quam,

Εἰς τὰσδε γὰρ βλέψας | ἐπηνεζάμην τάδε,

Κεῖνη γὰρ ὤλεσεν | τὰδ', εἰς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει,

at facto tamen rem comprobari. Nempe tota ista observatio talis est, ut, qui sic omnes tragicorum versus per singulos pedes examinare volet, multa possit huiusmodi, quæ casu facta sunt, pro regulis vendere. Quid est enim, quod, ut ipse fatetur vir doctus, qui hanc observationem in medium attulit, Æschylus ac Sophocles sæpe violaverant legem istam, Euripides autem, multo illis alias negligentior, eam observavit?" The concession made by the learned author of the rule adverted to, viz. that it cannot be accounted for, is fatal to the cause he advocates. But although the regulation with which he has furnished us does not admit of satisfactory explanation, yet the practice of the ancient Greek tragedians in the particular alluded to, presents in this respect no very formidable difficulty. We ask with confidence, whether elision does not, in the former of the examples brought forward, connect *βλέψας* with *ἐπηνεζάμην*, and whether the sense does not require that no pause should be made between *ὤλεσέν* and *νιν* of the latter? Thus the verses which may be adduced in confirmation of the reviewer's remark, do not in reality allow of being divided into two equal parts, and in consequence, do not contain any metrical impropriety. And enlarging and modifying the regulation to the extent required by the principle on which we have explained the practice of the Attic tragedians in the particular it affects, we shall find it a correct and excellent illustration of the rule of Professor Porson on the subject. Let it be remembered, that the metre demands that each dipode should be, *in some measure*, distinguished in the recitation, the degree being determined by circumstances; but the less metrical pause occurring after the former foot of a dipode when terminating with a word, is in a sense more a privilege than a right, and must be yielded up when an intimate connexion in meaning subsists between the first foot and the word following.

It remains only to investigate the influence of the ictus metricus on the quantity of certain syllables. Already has it been stated, that this term is used by critics to designate the stress of voice

laid on particular syllables in the recitation of every verse; which syllables are determined by the nature of the metre. This stress of voice is undeniably the essence of accent or syllabic emphasis, both prosaic and metrical; but it involves a slight increase of length to the syllable on which it rests. If it falls on a vowel, it prolongs its sound in some slight degree; and if it falls on a consonant, it doubles it in a measure in pronunciation. Still there remains no inconsiderable difference in length, between $\acute{\epsilon}$ and η , $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota$ and $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$: of the latter case it may be said with great propriety, that in the last form the consonant is repeated, whilst in the first the accent causes its sound to reverberate. Thus we find that a peculiar prominence or importance accrues to the accented syllable: and in virtue of this prominence, a syllable, which must otherwise be considered short, might occupy the place of a long one, both in Homeric and Attic poetry. Let it be observed further, that all short syllables are not equally short; and that there is a class of syllables, which, though of themselves accounted short, are yet longer than the bulk of short syllables, such as, a short vowel before $\pi\lambda$, $\kappa\lambda$, &c., a final diphthong before a word beginning with a vowel. When it falls on syllables of this description, it makes them important enough to stand for long ones, and too important to stand for short ones; and to such syllables the lengthening power of the metrical accent appears to have been restricted by the writers of Grecian tragedy. Extremely few are the instances of a final short vowel, before an initial consonant, lengthened *in arsi*, or when the syllable receives the accent, when that consonant is not the letter ρ ; in the plays we have particularly specified only two occur, and the authority of these readings is far from being sufficient to justify the usage. The passages are as follows:

"Απρακτος ὑμῖν εἰμὶ, τῶν ὑπαὶ [ὑπὸ] γένους. Antig. 1035.

Χαλκῆς ὑπαὶ [ὑπὸ] σάλπιγγος ἦξαν· οἱ δ' ἔμα. Electr. 711.

And it appears, that $\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\iota$ γένους is improperly put in the former for γένους ὑπο, and that in the latter, ἄρ' ὑπὸ is the true lection. A short vowel, which followed by a consonant constitutes a monosyllable, (or the last syllable of a word,) is once lengthened in the manuscript copies of Sophocles, before a word beginning with a vowel. We refer to the 1241st verse of the Antigone;

Τέλη λαχὼν δέϊλαος εἶν [ἐν] "Αἰδου δόμοις.

but the reading of Mss. has been disapproved of by every commentator of note. Various are the conjectures of the literati respecting the expression of Sophocles: for our own part we readily acquiesce in the opinion of Heath, already adopted by Schæfer and Erfurdt, viz. that the original phrase was, ἐν γ' "Αἰδου δόμοις. Leaving final syllables, we meet with four instances of a short vowel in the middle of a word, followed by a single consonant, not ρ , being lengthened *in arsi*, contrary to the general

- usage of the tragedians of Athens; of a short vowel being lengthened in these circumstances, when followed by another vowel or diphthong, there is not, as far as our knowledge extends, one single instance in the eleven plays above enumerated. The verses just alluded to, do not bear the strongest marks of correctness; and in questioning the correctness of the vulgar lections, we only tread in the steps of most critical annotators. They are,

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦλθες πρὸς Μολοσσὸν δάπεδα. Prom. Vinc. 854.

Τὸν δ', ἄμφι μέσῃ [μέσῃ] περιπετῇ προσκείμενον. Antig. 1223.

Ἦρσισε πλευραῖς μέσσον [μέσον] ἔγχος, ἐς δ' ὑγρόν. Antig. 1236.

Ἐννοικος ἔσομ' [ἔσομ'] ἀλλὰ τῇδε πρὸς πύλῃ. Electr. 818.

Porson, for δάπεδα in the first, substitutes γάπεδα : of which correction the learned and accurate Maltby fully approves. Professor Dunbar, a critic of the greatest talent and most extensive literary attainments, but too partial, we are inclined to suspect, to the ictus metricus, condemns the word γάπεδα as inconsistent with the import of the passage; to alter is not, however, in this case, to impair. Bishop Blomfield, well known, and deservedly esteemed a critic of the soundest judgment, has adopted the conjecture of Porson in the text of his edition, but in his notes has mentioned another emendation :

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦλθες δάπεδα πρὸς Μολοσσικά,

an emendation displaying great classical skill, but not equal in probability to that of Porson. In the second and third of the above lines, Hermann, in his notes on the Hecuba of Euripides, substitutes,

Τὸν δ', ἄμφι περιπετῇ μέσῃ προσκείμενον,

Πλευριῦσι μέσον ἤρεισεν ἔγχος, ἐς δ' ὑγρόν.

but in his manuscript notes on Sophocles, subsequently given to Erfurdt, he expresses himself dissatisfied with his own corrections, and, still condemning μέσσος as incorrect, he acknowledges his inability to remove the impropriety satisfactorily, otherwise than by replacing μέσσος for μέσσος. Nothing can be more proper than the above emendation of the former of the two passages; but the substitution of μέσσος is preferable in the latter, and in the following line of a fragment of the Thyestis of Sophocles :

Εἰτ' ἡμαρ αὔξει μέσσον, [μέσον,] ὄμφακος τρόπον.

The Epic poets, Aristophanes and Menander, as Hermann observes, employ the word μέσσος; and that no instance of its being used by the Attic tragedians has been hitherto discovered or noticed, is, rather than otherwise, in favor of Hermann's sentiments; inasmuch as the corruption of the verses may be easily traced to the unnecessary scruples of some transcriber on this head. That the fourth passage is incorrect, is universally admitted; and in order to remove the elision of the final diphthong αι, and the doubling of the σ in ἔσομμι, numerous emendations

have been proposed, the best of which is that of Hermann, approved of by Erfurdt in his note on the 191st verse of the Ajax:

Ξύνοικος εἴσειμ'· ἀλλὰ τῇδε πρὸς πύλῃ.

On the whole, we conclude that the Attic precision did not allow of the admission of such short syllables for long ones, even when rendered prominent by the ictus metricus; but that, on the contrary, it confined the lengthening power of the metrical accent to that class of syllables, which, though of themselves reckoned short, are nevertheless considerably longer than the bulk of short syllables.

In considering this description of syllables, we have to notice, in the first place, the case of a short vowel preceding the single consonant *ρ*, particularly in two separate words, or such a compound as *περίρυντος*. This liquid, when it begins a word, is written *ρ*; and indeed a peculiar degree of force appears to have been given to it when thus situated, a force it retained in a compounded word of the above nature. And thus it was that, agreeably to the observations of Mr. Tate, a gentleman of great learning and true classical taste, and of Professor Dunbar, the syllable in question was invariably short in these, but long *in arsi*. Accordingly we never meet with such a tribrach as *δύῳ ῥέουσι*. Instances of the attention paid to this regulation may be seen in Soph. Œd. Tyr. 847. Œd. Col. 900. Antig. 712. Fragm. Scyriar. (iv. Brunck.), Amphiarai iv. Prom. Vinet. 771. 991. Œd. Tyr. 72: the last three passages have been already cited by Mr. Tate.

It is observable that the last syllable of a spondee is seldom formed by a short vowel preceding the liquid *ρ* under the circumstances detailed; a fact which can only be explained on the hypothesis that the metrical accent fell with greater force on the latter syllable of an iamb *υ-*, than on that of the spondee *-*, the long syllable of the foot being that on which the metrical accent falls, and the position of the ictus in the spondee being regulated by its position in the principal foot of the verse. The case of a final long vowel or diphthong before a word beginning with a vowel, has been adverted to in the first chapter. By a species of elision, the long vowel or diphthong so situated loses too much of its length to stand for a long syllable, though not reduced in length to a common short one; accordingly, receiving the ictus, it must be considered long; without it, short. Many philologists are of opinion that it is precisely equivalent to a common short syllable; but this sentiment, not more probable in itself, will involve us in practical difficulties from which the other totally exempts us, difficulties that cannot be satisfactorily overcome. We allude particularly to Homeric and Virgilian poetry: to specify would be inconsistent with our present arrangement, and divert us from the subject under especial consideration. Under this view we shall conclude by observing, that this theory of a final long

vowel or diphthong, though applicable to a dactylic, anapæstic, trochaic and iambic metre, is of use chiefly in the two former; the arrangement it affects seldom if ever occurring in the trochaic and iambic systems of the Greek tragedians.

Thirdly, the diphthong *oi* in the middle of a word, followed by a long vowel or diphthong, is not made sufficiently long in pronunciation to be considered a long syllable when *in thesi*; but the syllable, when it receives the accent, has too much importance to occupy the place of a short one. This may be confirmed by numerous examples, of which the following are a part: *Æd. Tyr.* 13. *Æd. Col.* 262. 278. *Soph. Electr.* 319. 385. *Prom. Vinc.* 971. 988. *Trach.* 1077. 1119. *Ajac.* 1375. To quote instances of the diphthong lengthened *in arsi*, is altogether needless. It admits however of a question, whether the rule is applicable to the diphthong *oi* in the middle of a word, before *any vowel*, or only before a long vowel or another diphthong. One verse which seems to favor the former opinion has lately come to our knowledge, and others may in all probability be found on diligent search. The verse alluded to is the 1415th of the *Ædipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles,

Οὐδεις οἶός τε πλὴν γ' ἐμοῦ φέρειν βροτῶν·

but the true reading of this line may be,

Οἶός τέ γ' οὐδεις πλὴν ἐμοῦ φέρειν βροτῶν.

Many Mss. omit the *γ'*.

It would appear that, in the pronunciation of the Attics, the diphthong *oi* before a short vowel retained the full force of a diphthong, and thus was invariably long. But the fourth case, in which the ictus affects the quantity of syllables, is of more importance than either of the preceding. The two metrical canons of Dawes are well known to the classical world, and have ever since their appearance been the subject of critical investigation. The former relates exclusively to comic poetry; the latter is common to comic and tragic.

CANON I.

A short vowel either before one of the soft mutes *π, κ, τ*, or one of the aspirates *φ, χ, θ*, followed by any liquid whatever, and before one of the medials *β, γ, δ*, the liquid *ρ* following, invariably constitutes a short syllable.

CANON II.

A short vowel before one of the medial mutes *β, γ, δ*, followed by any liquid besides *ρ*, invariably constitutes with the following consonants a long syllable.

The usages of Grecian comedy are foreign to our present subject, and to this branch of ancient poetry our observations on these canons have no reference. Porson then says, that *Æschylus* and

Sophocles have often violated the latter canon, but that Euripides has constantly observed it: he accordingly suspects the 1021st verse of the *Electra* of this poet to have been corrupted by transcribers:

Γυναικῶ, γλώσση πικρότης ἐνεστί τις.

Erfurdt defends the present lection by quoting a line of *Æschylus*, preserved by Photius, in which a similar usage prevails,

Κέντημα γλώσσης σκοπίου βέλος λέγω.

In another criticism on this canon, and it appears a later one, Porson considers it of general not universal application, and instances *Æd. Tyr.* 717. *Electr. Soph.* 410. as examples of its violation. Most probably the reading of the above verse of Euripides is correct, and the three tragedians may be viewed as equally involved in the occasional neglect of the rule in the case of *γλ* and *βλ*. In the works of Sophocles, we have two instances of a short vowel preceding the consonants *βλ*, remaining short, in addition to the two mentioned by Porson, viz. *Æd. Col.* 972. and a Fragment of the *Amphitryo* of Sophocles preserved by the scholiast in the remarks on *Æd. Col.* 390; and to these may be added a verse of some unknown author referred to by the scholiast, in the annotations on the 620th verse of the *Antigone*. Excepting the case of *βλ* and *γλ*, no correct verse can be produced from the extant tragedies of *Æschylus*, Sophocles, and Euripides, in which the second canon of Dawes is not observed.—Respecting the usage of Tragic poetry in reference to the particulars embraced by the first canon, Porson has the ensuing observations: “Although the tragedians often lengthen these syllables, properly short by position, yet they much more frequently regard them as short; so that where you meet with one instance of the former practice, nearly three of the latter will occur. That species of license, however, (viz. the lengthening of the syllable,) takes place chiefly in simple words, as *τέκνον*, *πατρός*. Much more seldom in compounds, if the syllable in question be at the junction of the parts, as *πολύχρυσος*, *Andr.* 2. Equally rare are the instances of an augment being lengthened, as in *ἐπέκλωσεν*, *Orest.* 12. *κέκλησθαι*, *Soph. Electr.* 366; and still more rarely is the syllable lengthened when it is formed by the junction of a preposition to another word, as in *ἀπότροποι*, *Phœn.* 600. But when a word ends with a short vowel, and the next begins with two consonants that allow of its continuing short, there is not, I believe, one uncorrupted verse, in which it is made long.” These remarks are truly Porsonian, displaying the greatest talent and industry, and being, with the exception of the last period, perfectly correct: they are notwithstanding defective, inasmuch as they do not furnish the principles, on which the shortening or lengthening of the vowel situated as the canon mentions depends. The principles, however, are simple and certain, and stand connected with the clearest and most evi-

dent principles of poetic recitation. First, when a metrical pause is to be made after the syllable, its quantity depends on the vowel being separated from both, or joined to one only of the consonants, by the pause :

Ὁξύστυμδος γὰρ Ζηνὸς ἀκμαγεῖς κύνας. Prom. Vinc. 828.

When no pause is to be made after the syllable, the mute and liquid requiring little more exertion to be pronounced together than a single consonant requires, owing to the nature of the liquid, which readily glides, so to speak, into the sound of the preceding consonant, the syllable in consequence ranks among those which, though longer than the generality of short syllables, have not a sufficient degree of length to be considered of themselves long syllables ; and thus, in all kinds of Tragic verse, when the syllable receives the ictus metricus, it is used for a long syllable, and when it does not, for a short one.

ὦ τέκνα Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή. Œd. Tyr. 1.

Ἄ γ'ὼ δίκαιῶν μὴ παρ' ἀγγέλων τέκνα. Ibid. 6.

On these principles all correction of the two following verses is unnecessary :

Αἰσχροὺν παρὰ κλαίουσι θινῶσθαι φίλοις. Alcest. 558.

Δορὶ κρατῆσαι, μήτε νοστήσαι ποτε. Œd. Col. 1386.

In iambic metre the two consonants *can* only be separated by the less metrical pause, which is imperceptible to the hearer unless particularly attentive to the recitation. These rules are applicable not only to the combinations of consonants mentioned in the first canon of Dawes, but likewise to βλ and γλ. To produce verses in their support is altogether needless, as every system abounds with proofs of their correctness ; whilst in the tragedies to which particularly appeal has been made, there are but three passages (exclusive of those mentioned in the first chapter) in which they are violated, and the claims of the present readings of these to correctness are of the weakest possible nature. In the second verse of the Prometheus Vincetus, the lection of the old edition is to be adopted :

Σκύθην ἐς οἶμον, ἄβατον εἰς ἐρημίαν.

The word ἄβροτον introduced into the text by Porson, on the authority of Hesychius, Eustathius, the Scholia Villosioni on Homer, and the Mss. of Suidas, was most probably a gloss on the true reading : —ον ἄβρο— cannot be admitted for a tribrach. The second of the passages referred to, is the 880th verse of the Trachiniæ, the numbers of which are any thing but Sophoclean :

Τάλαιν' ὀλεθρία, τίνι τρόπῳ θανεῖν σφε φῆς ;

The true reading may be,

Τάλαιν' ὀλεθρία, σὺ πῶς θανεῖν σφε φῆς ;

a reading suitable to the astonished and confounded state of the speaker's mind; and we can suppose that the word *σὺ* was in the first place omitted by mistake, and that a transcriber substituted *τίμι πρόπῳ* from a regard to metre. The third verse, viz. Electr. Soph. 691. has been already corrected with success by Hermann.

To conclude: Viewing these several theories of Tragic versification collectively, we think it not extravagant to say of them, that, consistent and probable in themselves, they are justified by every acknowledged principle of the Greek language, and confirmed by every authority that can be denominated classical; nor can the characteristic qualities of the system be better expressed, than by a repetition of the motto, "*Omnino causæ prius investigandæ sunt, quam regulæ constituendæ.*"

DE VERSIBUS SPURIIS APUD ÆSCHYLUM DISSERTATIO.¹

ARS critica ita exerceri a plerisque solet, ut, quoniam omnis ejus vis in judicandi sollertia expromitur, nullam ejus esse disciplinam existimare videantur. Quæ res facit, ut, dum vel sensum quisque suum vel opinionem aliquam aut consuetudinem sequitur, non ubique justa et apta medendi ratio adhibeatur. At hujus quoque artis ratio quædam est ac disciplina, quæ et modos emendandi explicat, et ubi singulis horum modorum utendum sit, præcipit, et quousque eorum usus pateat, docet. Quæ omnia quo majus sæpe in emendando momentum habent, tanto magis optandum est, ut, existat, qui omnem hujus artis rationem accuratius, quam adhuc factum est, explanet: præsertim quum interdum etiam primarios viros in hoc genere errare videamus. Nam quum nulla emendandi ratio per se ipsa spernenda sit, tamen translata, quo non debet, vel modum, qui quoque loco tenendus est, egrediens, obsit potius, quam prosit, necesse est. Monebo, data scribendi opportunitate, juvenes litterarum studiosos de illa tantum ratione, quæ indagandis spuriis continetur: in qua quidam ita sibi placuerunt, ut vix quidquam adversus eorum suspensiones satis munitum fuerit. Sunt autem genera additamentorum, quibus scripta veterum deformata sunt, plura. Nam modo interpretationes vocabulorum, quæ glossemata vocantur, modo enarrationes sententiarum,

¹ Edita est a. 1814.

modo locos similes adjectos videmus: prætereaque interdum trajectum est aliquid eo, quo non debebat, vel casu etiam, & quo nihil tutum est, illatum. Verum bene tenendum est, hæc non æque omnia in quovis scriptore obvia esse, sed quæ horum non errori debentur, in his fere scriptoribus inveniri, qui quum multum lectitarentur, largam etiam adnotandi opportunitatem præbebant. Quare ut in his attenti esse debemus, ne quid alienum nos lateat, ita in iis, qui minorem experti sunt lectorum assiduitatem, cavendum, ne in suspicionem vocemus, quæ genuina sunt. Utar exemplo Æschyli. Hic quum aliquanto minus, quam Euripides, in scholis grammaticorum tractatus fuerit, consentaneum est, etiam paucioribus eum vel adnotationibus, vel interpolationibus, vel insitiis versibus esse corruptum. Ex quo intelligi potest, non satis caute fecisse, qui plurimos hujus poetæ versus ut spurios damnarunt. Nam ut semel iterumve alienus apud eum versus reperiatur, veluti in Persis post v. 253. libri quidam Sophoclis versum inserunt,

στέργει γὰρ οὐδείς ἄγγελον κακῶν ἐπῶν,

quem in censum veniunt in eadem fabula etiam v. 780. et in Sept. ad Th. v. 607. at plerisque in locis, qui maxime spurii visi sunt versus, non nisi aut interpretatione justa, aut apta emendatione, aut restitutione in locum suum indigent, ut maxime genuinos esse appareat. Quin quum sapius apud Æschylum omittendo, quam addendo peccatum sit, est etiam, ubi hiatus non solum animadvertere, sed etiam explere possis, inserendis, qui neglecti ab librariis fuerunt, versibus. Placet singula horum uno alterove exemplo confirmare.

Agamemnonis hoc est initium :

θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τᾶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων
φρουρᾶς ἐτείας μῆκος, ἣν κοιμώμενος
στέγαις Ἀτρεΐδων ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην,
ἄστρων κάτοιδα νυκτέρων ὁμήγουριν,
καὶ τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ θέρος βροτοῖς
λαμπροὺς δυνάστας, ἐμπρέποντας αἰθέρι
ἀστέρας, ὅταν φθίνωσιν, ἀντολάς τε τῶν.

Versum, qui horum ultimus est, ut ineptum, prætereaque Achilli Tatii ignotum, damnarunt Valckenarius ad Eurip. Phœn. 506. Porsonus in Append. ad Toup. Not. in Suid. T. iv. p. 479. alique, vereor ne injuria. Nam Achillis Tatii exigua auctoritas est, qui et valde corruptus sit, et paullo ante etiam in alio Æschyli loco omittat, quæ adjicienda fuisse existimes. Versus autem ipse tantum abest ut ineptus sit, ut, si memineris, usitata Græcis ratione τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ θέρος ἀστέρας, ὅταν φθίνωσιν dictum esse pro ὅταν φθίνωσιν οἱ χεῖμα καὶ

θέρος φέγοντες ἀστέρες, etiam aptissimus videatur. Hōc enim dicit ille: *video et cæctum stellarum, et quando quodque illorum siderum, ex quibus anni tempestates numeramus, occidit atque oritur.*

In Choëphoris Electra manes patris invocans, fratremque ad patranda[m] cædem exhortans, his verbis utitur v. 506.

ἄκου· ὑπὲρ σοῦ τοιάδ' ἔστ' ὀδύρματα.
αὐτὸς δὲ σώζει τόνδε τιμήσας λόγον.
καὶ μὴν ἀμάρφητον δέ τινα τὸν λόγον,
τίμημα τύμβου τῆς ἀνοιμώκτου τύχης.
τὰ δ' ἄλλ', ἐπειδὴ δρᾶν κατάρθωσαι φρενί,
ἔρδοις ἂν ἤδη, δαίμονος πειρώμενος.

Secundum ex his versibus spurium putarat Schützius: quem reprehendens Porsonus in Suppl. præf. ad Eurip. Hec. p. 37. manifesto spurium esse contendit sequentem versum, omissum in cod. Guelf. et ed. Ald. et ei, qui sequitur, versui subjectum in ed. Rob. At uterque, si quidquam apud Æschylum, genuinus est, modo corrupta recte emendes. Neque enim apparet, unde venerit tale additamentum. Partem veri Seidlerus vidit, legendum putans,

καὶ μὴν ἀμεμφῇ τόνδ' ἔτεινα τὸν λόγον.

Non tamen perfecit emendationem. Nam particulæ καὶ μὴν non aliter hic aptæ sunt, quam si alius personæ orationem incipiant. Atqui quid planius est, quam Oresti Electræque se invicem ad vindicandam patris necem cohortantibus chorum adstipulari his verbis:

καὶ μὴν ἀμεμφῇ τόνδ' ἐτείνατον λόγον,
τίμημα τύμβου τῆς ἀνοιμώκτου τύχης.

Quæ ille quum dixisset, reliquis duobus versibus ad solum Oresten, cujus illud officium erat, ut rem perpetraret, se convertit.

Sed diximus supra, cavendum etiam esse, ne spurios pute-mus eos versus, qui nihil nisi in alienum locum trajecti sunt. Ita in eadem fabula hæc leguntur, v. 162.

ἔχει μὲν ἤδη γαπότους χοὰς πατήρ,
κῆρυξ μεγίστη τῶν ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω.
νέου δὲ μύθου τοῦδε κοινωνήσατε.

Advertit, qui medius horum versuum est, Robortellum, ut post eum lacunæ signum poneret. Nec dubium est, versum illum, sic, ut nunc est, reliquis insertum, adeo ineptum esse, ut mirum sit, qui alias ad ejiciendos versus promptissimi sunt, hic ad lacunam confugere maluisse. Quid enim? Quidquid excidissee statuas, num tale erit, ut Mercurii invocationem hic aptam esse efficias? Non opinor equidem. Quod si superiora considera-

veris, facile, spero, adduceris, ut versum illum, lacerato vel ejusdem paginæ supremo, vel præcedentis folii imo margine, alienam sedem occupasse tibi persuadeas. Apertum enim hujus rei indicium præbent illa v. 122.

————— Ἑρμῇ χθόνιε, κηρύξας ἐμοὶ
τοὺς γῆς ἐνερθε δαίμονας κλύειν ἐμὰς
εὐχάς.

Unde quid aliud colligemus, quam, quo nihil inveniri aptius aut convenientius potest, ita processisse hanc orationem :

κήρυξ μέγιστε τῶν ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω,
ἄκουσον, Ἑρμῇ χθόνιε, κηρύξας ἐμοὶ
τοὺς γῆς ἐνερθε δαίμονας κλύειν ἐμὰς
εὐχάς.

Apparet, verbum κηρύξας, quod aliter obscurum foret, nunc habere quo referatur, prægresso nomine κήρυξ.

In Agamemnone Cassandra, ultorem exstiturum esse Agamemnonis significans, his verbis utitur v. 1289.

ἤξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμᾶρος,
μητρικτόνον φίτυμα, ποινάτωρ πατρός,
φυγὰς δ' ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος
κάτεισιν ἅτας τάσδε θριγκώσων φίλοις.
ἄξειν νιν ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός.
τί δῆτ' ἐγὼ κάτοικος ᾧδ' ἀναστένω;
ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον εἶδον Ἰλίου πόλιν
πράξασαν, ὡς ἔπραξεν, οἱ δ' εἶχον πόλιν,
οὕτως ἀπαλλάσσουσιν ἐν θεῶν κρίσει,
ἰοῦσα πρᾶξω· τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν.
ὁμώμοται γὰρ ὄρκος ἐκ θεῶν μέγας.
Ἰλίου πύλας δὲ τάσδ' ἐγὼ προσενέπω.
ἐπεύχομαι δὲ καιρίας πληγῆς τυχεῖν,
ὡς ἀσφάδαστο, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμων
ἀπορρύντων, ὅμμα συμβάλω τόδε.

Versum, qui in his quintus est, quum non habere, unde penderet, critici animadverterent, ἄξειν in ἄξει mutarunt. At tam abrupta oratio, præsertim in sententia, quam, si abesset, nemo esset desideraturus, non potest non offensioni esse: ut mirer, non fuisse, qui eum ejectum mallet. Non minorem, si attendas, dubitationem movet undecimus ex his versibus. Quo si Cassandra illud indicare vult, necessario sibi moriendum esse, non modo brevius id atque obscurius, quam par est, significat, sed etiam gravius de se et magnificentius loquitur, quam illa, in qua est, animi affectio ferre videtur. Quod sentiens Schützius primo versum ut spurium damnavit, nuper autem post illum, de quo ante dicebamus, posuit. Mirum vero, præstantissimum virum, ubi semel viderat, alieno loco eum versum legi, non quod nobis

versum, qui ante ultimum est, uncis inclusit, auctore Heathio :¹ quem versum equidem non minus genuinum esse puto, quam quos in eadem fabula, ingeniose sane et non sine specie veri, eaque etiam a metro et antistrophicorum lege desumpta, Seidlerus de versu, dochm. p. 408. damnavit, v. 1530.

οὐκ ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι θάνατον

τῷδε γενέσθαι.

Sed nolo his inhiomari, quæ longiorem disputationem requirunt. Illud miror, editorem Glasguensem non uncis inclusisse hæc in Sept. ad Theb. v. 890. οὐκ ἐπὶ φιλίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ φόνῳ διεκρίθητε, quæ tam manifesto interpretis verba sunt, ut non videam, quomodo id ullum latere potuerit criticum. Tametsi nuper priorem versiculum defendere conatus est censor editionis Schützianæ in Diar. Jenens. 1813. mense Octobri p. 117. Sed hic vir nondum eam, quam velis, cum Æschylo videtur familiaritatem contraxisse. Glasguensis quidem editor, ut hæc damnare debebat, ita non debebat, Piersoni motus iudicio, in Eumen. v. 1017. verbo ἐπιδιπλοῖω uncas apponere. Sed sæpius ille alios, nec semper fidos duces sequitur.

Sed ut addendo peccatum est apud Æschylum rarius, ita frequentissime, multoque sæpius, quam critici animadverterunt, erratum est omittendo. Cujus rei quum plurima possim exempla proferre, paucis tantum utar, quæ sunt ejusmodi, ut reponi, quod omissum est, posse videatur.

Mos est tragicorum, versus inter colloquentes personas æquali lege distribuere, nec nisi aut in initio, aut in fine uni personæ plures, quam alteri, versus dare. Sed faciunt hoc etiam in medio colloquio, ibi quidem, ubi materia colloquii mutatur, ut quasi novum institui videatur colloquium. Itaque aliquam rationem habet locus in Prometheus v. 623. ubi quum Prometheus et Io singulis, versibus alternassent, de Prometheus colloquentes, jam Io, de se sermonem injectura, duobus versibus Prometheus alloquitur, progredientibus deinde per singulos versus vicibus :

ΙΩ. καὶ πρὸς γε τούτοις τέρμα τῆς ἐμῆς πλάνης
δείξον, τίς ἔσται τῇ τάλαιπώρῳ χρόνος.

ΠΡ. τὸ μὴ μαθεῖν σοι κρεῖσσον ἢ μαθεῖν τάδε.

ΙΩ. μήτοι με κρύψῃς τοῦθ', ὅπερ μέλλω παθεῖν.

Sed utcumque hæc defendantur, responsio puellæ non satis convenire videtur cum eo, quod Prometheus dixerat. Nam quum particula μήτοι concludentis sit, contrarium potius quam

¹ Fecit id profecto ipse Poisonus in ea, quæ genuina ejus est Æschyli editio.

illud, quod dicit, concludere debebat, ut rectius adversativa particula usura fuerit, ἀλλὰ μὴ με κρύψῃς τοῦθ', ὅπερ μέλλω παθεῖν. Vide vero miram ad hunc locum scholiastæ adnotationem: λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι, ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, ταῦτα καὶ γενήσεται. Quæ quid aliud, quam facit, ut suspicari debeamus, interpretem istum, quum versum illum in margine adscriptum videret, pro sententia eum nescio cujus habuisse, et promde, additis verbis λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὅτι, commentario suo inseruisse. Nam ut taceam, versum illum omnino dignissimum esse Æschylo, quid vel gravius hoc loco, vel accommodatius ad nexum orationis scribi potuit, quam hoc:

ΠΡ. τὸ μὴ μαθεῖν σοι κρείσσον ἢ μαθεῖν τάδε.

ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, ταῦτα καὶ γενήσεται.

ΙΩ. μὴ τοι με κρύψῃς τοῦθ', ὅπερ μέλλω παθεῖν.

Jam enim et recte concludet Io, et duobus hujus versibus totidem versibus Prometheus respondebit.

In Agamemnone hæc leguntur v. 599.

καὶ τίς μ' ἐνίπτων εἶπε· φρυκτῶρων διὰ
πεισθεῖσα, Τροίαν νῦν πεπορθῆσθαι δοκεῖς;
ἢ κάρτα πρὸς γυναικός, αἰεσθαι κέαρ.
λόγοις τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὐδ' ἐφαινόμην·
ὅμως δ' ἔθυσον.

Nihil est in his, quod desideretur. Non inepte tamen suspicaris, poetam scripsisse:

λόγοις τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὐδ' ἐφαινόμην,
πεισθεῖσα τῷ φέροντι θέσκελον φάτιν.

Addit enim hunc versum scriptor Christi patientis v. 75. qui, quod satis mirum est, solam ex Æschyli fabulis Agamemnonem videtur cognitam habuisse.

Possem his addere alia. Veluti in Persis divinari, nisi fallor, locus potest, ubi versus ille exciderit, ex quo scholiastes Her-mogenis, citatus a Bastio ad Greg., Cor. p. 241. vocabulum ὑπόξυλος affert. Pariterque, quæ ex eadem fabula ab Athenæo p. 86. B. commemorantur corruptissima verba, τίς ἀνήρει τὰς νήσους ἀναριτοτρόφους, quorum tamen ultimum recte in codice scriptum est νηριτοτρόφους, neque ad Phrynichum, neque ad Epichar-mum, neque ad alteram Æschyli Persarum editionem pertinere, sed ex ea ipsa, quam nunc habemus, editione, excidisse veri simile est: quod ubi factum videatur, nunc quidem iis quærendum relinquam, quibus minus, quam mihi, difficilis videtur hujus poetæ emendatio. Sed unum tamen ex illa fabula locum attingere placet. Est is a v. 537.

πολλὰ δ' ἀπαλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας

κατερικόμεναι, διαμυδαλέοις

δάκρυσιν κόλπους

τέγγουσ' ἄλγους μετέχουσαι.

αἱ δ' ἀβρογόοι Περσίδες ἀνδρῶν
 ποθέουσαι ἰδεῖν ἀρτιζυγίαν,
 λέκτρων τ' εὐνάς ἀβροχίτωνας,
 χλαδανῆς ἥβης τέρψιν ἀφείσαι, .
 πενθοῦσι γόοις ἀκορεστοτάτοις.

Senserunt critici, duas hic feminarum classes commemorari, quarum secunda uxores Persarum complectitur, prima autem quæ sit, ex verbis poetæ tam parum colligi potest, ut potius omnes Persicæ mulieres intelligendæ videantur: quod tamen repugnat sequentibus. Itaque Bothius, videns lectionem quorundam librorum ἀταλαῖς in grandævas mulieres quadrare, de his et recte quidem, sermonem esse intellexit: sed quum, emendare locum volens, πολλὰι in πολὶαῖ mutavit, canos nobis capillos pro canis mulieribus exhibuit. Rectius Schützio visus est versus excidisse. Eamque suspicionem egregie confirmat unus quidem, sed optimæ notæ codex, Vitebergensis, in quo post verbum κατερεικόμεναι luculentis litteris additum est μαγνὰδ, ut pene incredibile sit, negligi hoc a Zeunio in collatione hujus codicis potuisse. Hæc vero quantumvis corrupta vox, si compendia scripturæ in codicibus usitata in auxilium advoce, non magno negotio optimam lectionem præbebit :

πολλὰι δ' ἀταλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας
 κατερεικόμεναι μαῖαι γονάδες
 * διαμυδαλέσις δάκρυσι κόλπους
 τέγγουσ', ἄλγους μετέχουσαι.

Μαῖα enim secundum Hesychium matris honorifica appellatio est. Idem etiam alterum vocabulum, ex hoc ipso fortasse loco sumptum, tuetur : γονάδες, μητέρες. Et ita hic locus similis fiet iis, quæ supra dicta erant v. 64.

τοκέες τ' ἄλοχοί θ' ἡμερολεγδὼν
 τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέονται.

Cæterum in eandem conjecturam incidit, jussus a me ipse videre, quid lateret in illa codicis Viteb. lectione, unus ex iis, quorum hic vitæ subjiciuntur, Chr. Tr. G. Hildebrandus, juvenis optimæ indolis.

LETTERS
TO
MR. ARCHDEACON TRAVIS,
IN ANSWER TO HIS
DEFENCE
OF THE
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES,
1 JOHN v. 7.
BY R. PORSON.
• LONDON:—1790.

LETTER VI.

Of the Vulgate Latin Version.

Sir,

AFTER a long interval, which, I dare say, has been equally painful to us both, I wait on you again according to my promise.¹ Having dispatched the Greek manuscripts, I proceed to the examination of those versions of the New Testament which contain the Catholic Epistles. You, who with a happy facility contrive to turn the balance in your favor, however the particulars may make against you, tell us, p. 205, 206. that, of the five ancient versions, the Italic, the Vulgate of Jerome, the Syriac, the Armenian, and the Coptic, three, the Italic, the Vulgate, and the Armenian, contain the disputed verse, 1 John v. 7. Pray, Sir, where is this Italic version to be found? Not in Mss., for you say, that there is not a single Ms. of it now certainly known to exist in the world, p. 90. Why, then, must this version be pressed into the service? Because it is cited by the writers who lived before Jerome. This version, therefore, ultimately resolves itself into the authority of those writers; and the number of ancient versions shrinks into four, unless, to fill up the vacancy, you will accept my gracious offer of the Slavonian version, to which you ought to have no objection, considering that you have also enlisted that into the orthodox army, p. 92. 206. Leaving, therefore, the examination of your quotations from Tertullian, Cyprian, &c. to another letter, I shall endeavor at present to treat of the Vulgate version with all possible brevity. In order to pave the way to this subject, I desire the reader to ask himself the following questions:—

¹ Gent. Mag. Aug. 1789, p. 697.

1. Does the Vulgate always closely follow the Greek, particularly in scrupulously guarding against interpolations?

2. Do all the Mss. of the Vulgate agree in retaining the three heavenly witnesses?

3. Do all that retain the seventh and eighth verses of 1 John v. represent them in the same manner, without any important alterations, omissions, or additions?

4. Have the orthodox Mss. the verse from the hand of the first writer, without ratures, interlineations, or marginal insertions?

5. Are they generally the oldest and best?

Unless these questions can be answered in the affirmative, the main prop and pillar of your cause will be in a very lame and tottering condition. For I need not tell you, Sir, because you must deny, nor need I tell the learned, because they cannot but know, that the chief support of this contested verse is the authority of the Vulgate. But whoever has inquired with the least share of diligence into the state of the Latin Mss. knows, that not one of these questions can be answered in the affirmative.

I allow you in advance, that a great majority of the Latin Mss. are on your side. Perhaps for one that omits the three heavenly witnesses, forty or fifty may be found that retain them. I searched, I confess, a long while without finding any others; and, that my readers may be as wise as myself, I will give them a collation of fifty Mss. or more, that I had the patience to consult.

1. Of this number thirty-two omit the final clause of the eighth verse; eighteen retain it, but one has it in the text underlined with red lead, two in the margin, one from the first, the other from a second hand.

2. One omits the final clause of the seventh verse.

3. Two read *filius* instead of *verbum*; with which two French Mss. sold by Messrs. Leigh and Sotheby, May 29, 1789, agree. (*le fils*.)

4. Two omit the epithet *sanctus*.

5. Nine change the order of the verses; but of these nine one begins the eighth verse with *et*, and the seventh with *quoniam*; on the other hand, one Ms. that preserves the common order, begins the seventh verse with *et*, and the eighth with *quoniam*.

6. The Mss. that retain the clause of the eighth verse read invariably either *et tres unum sunt*, or *et hi tres unum sunt*.

7. One adds the heavenly witnesses in the margin from the same hand; another is so fond of them as to insert them in the text, both before and after the others.

8. *En terre* is wanting in one French Ms. and *in terra* in a Latin Ms. at Ulme, quoted by Mr. Griesbach, p. 229.

With most of these variations some Mss. or other, collated by editors and critics, agree. One Ms. at Toledo, collated by Bianchini, adds *in Christo Jesu* in the eighth verse; which is added

in the seventh by the author De Trinitate, published, together with the writer against Varimadus, by Chifflet under the name of Vigilius Tapsensis. You seem, Sir, to acquiesce in Chifflet's judgment. But if you shall hereafter choose to make them two distinct witnesses, my candor is such, that I am determined to have no objection.

The same faithful and judicious writer¹ against Varimadus quotes for the earthly witnesses in the eighth verse, *aqua, sanguis, et caro*; and so reads the margin of a Colbertine Ms. quoted by Simon. If this reading had become fashionable, it would have prevented an objection which the heretics have made against the double mention of the spirit.

The addition *in Christo Jesu* I take to have at first belonged to the eighth verse, and to have been written by some pious person who meant thus to explain the verse; that the spirit, the water, and the blood, concur in bearing witness to Christianity. But when the seventh verse was framed on the model of the eighth, they whose copies had received this addition, transposed it together with the rest of the clause to the end of the seventh. One of my reasons for this opinion is, that some of the Mss. of Ambrose add these words at the end of the eighth verse.

I shall take little notice of the trifling omission of *in* before *unum*, because I think that it neither affects the sense of the passage, nor the credit of the Vulgate. The Greek Mss. from which that version was made, without doubt omitted *eis* from the identity of the preceding letters in *τρεῖς*. The preposition is omitted from the same cause in a passage of Cyril, and in the Greek Mss. of Euthymius Zigabenus.²

If all these various readings were presented in one view to any person endowed with common sense, moderately instructed in the principles of criticism, and uninfluenced in the present debate by interest or passion, he could not help concluding, that the number and importance of the various readings furnish reasonable ground for a suspicion of corruption. That a passage, which so often adds, omits, or alters particular words; which now precedes, now follows the unsuspected part of the text; which is sometimes seen in the body of the work, sometimes in the margin; sometimes by the same, sometimes by a different hand; sometimes after a rasure; which, in short, changes shapes faster than Proteus or Empusa; that such a passage is exceedingly questionable, whatever shape it assumes; and that, though it were not absolutely omitted by any Ms. an editor might yet hint his doubts, or

¹ See the Postscript to this Letter.

² Panopl. Dogm. Tit. xii. near the end, fol. 112. col. i. ed. Tergovist. See Mr. Matthæi on the Catholic Epistles, p. 141—143.

even avow his disbelief, of its genuineness, without justly incurring the censure of blasphemy or impiety.¹

But, allowing that this verse had been extant in the Vulgate even from the end of the second century, and without any of these suspicious appearances, is the merit of this version so high as to ratify and render genuine every word and sentence in which its Mss. conspire? Was it in no place corrupted in the days of Tertullian and Cyprian? If we are certain of any reading having constantly kept its place in the Latin copies, we are certain that they never read otherwise than *quod* in 1 Tim. iii. 16. instead of *Deus*. You, Sir, will probably defend the latter reading; nor shall I dispute it. But if we take the liberty of rejecting the authority of the Vulgate, when it is so consistent with itself, and so well supported as it is on 1 Tim. iii. 16. why may we not with equal right reject it, when it is the principal, if not the sole, support of a contested verse? Was the addition of the clause in 1 Pet. iii. 22. made by the first framers of the version from the warrant of Greek Mss.? Yet that has the general consent of the present Latin copies. Whoever undertakes the defence of such passages, may pretend that his aim is to establish the genuine text, but in fact he is exerting all his force to weaken and undermine its authority.

Thus I should argue, if all the Mss. consented in the received reading. I should think it an hazardous step to prefer any version to the unanimous consent of all the Greek Mss. now known to exist. Still less should I venture to rely on such a version, which, by having been more frequently copied, has also been more frequently interpolated than any other. The subsidiary streams which the river has received in its course have neither made the water more clear, nor more wholesome.

But we are told, p. 42. that, by the command of Charlemagne, Alcuin was employed in a revision of the Vulgate; that in Alcuin's Correctorium "the testimony of the three heavenly witnesses is read without the smallest impeachment of its authenticity;" and that this very volume was extant at Vauxcelles in the life of Baronius. You then add a supposition (for of suppositions you have a plentiful stock), that Alcuin and his assistants, in order to settle the text, referred to the Greek Mss., and not only to the Greek Mss. but to the best and oldest Greek Mss., some in all probability as old as the apostolical age. A lively fancy, Sir, is an indifferent accomplishment for a critic. You cannot prove that Alcuin ever saw a Greek Ms., much less that he collated any for the use of his edition. The knowledge of Greek was so scarce a commodity in those days, that the contrary supposition, which is

¹ Emlyn's Enquiry is called 'blasphemous and impious' in the Layman's Address to Convocation, 1717, p. 18.

expressly affirmed by Vallarsius,¹ is much the more probable of the two. It was labor and honor enough for Alcuin to collate the copies of the Vulgate. Neither can you prove that the Ms. at Vauxcelles is the original of Alcuin. For it is so customary to transcribe titles from older Mss., that the name of the corrector is no proof of the Ms. being written by the corrector, or in the same age. Besides, the ignorance shown in orthography² (as Wetstein observes) would tempt us to believe that it was written by an unskilful transcriber of Alcuin rather than by Alcuin himself. You will be delighted, Sir, I doubt not, to hear, that this "treasure of inestimable value" is still in being. Blanchini has given a specimen of the character in his *Evangelium Quadruplex*, from which it appears, as far as I can judge, to be less ancient than he would make it. But in these matters most editors are naturally apt to be a little partial. When you say, that 1 John v. 7. is found in this famous Ms. without "the smallest impeachment of its authenticity," what do you mean by "the smallest impeachment?" Would you have the writer of the Ms. inform his readers, by a marginal note, that he had inserted a spurious verse in his edition? An editor would hardly be mad enough to become such a *filo de se*.

But I shall advance one step farther, and maintain that this Ms., on which so much stress is laid, is at least as much against the verse as in its favor. For how is the verse read in this Ms.? Not in the text, but in the margin are added these words:—*Sicut tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo, pater, verbum, et spiritus sanctus, et tres unum sunt*. The text has only these words, *Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt*. Between *sunt* and *qui* the same hand has interlined *in terra*.³ Now, Sir, this is so far from being a "small impeachment" of your favorite verse, that it is a direct and violent attack on it: for it plainly says, that the Latin Mss. varied; and it more than hints, that the older surviving Mss. were without the addition of the heavenly witnesses. If, then, this Ms. was only a copy of Alcuin's autograph, Alcuin might be unacquainted with this verse, though without its aid he believed the doctrine which it is supposed to contain, as appears from his treatise on the Trinity.

I have purposely omitted, in my former account of the various readings, one of the most important, that I might introduce it here. The reader will easily guess that I mean the connexion of

¹ In Blanchini's *Vindiciæ Veteris Vulgatæ*, p. 326.

² Such, for instance, as *Canonorum* for *Canonicarum*, &c. Vitali seems to speak of another Ms. written by Alcuin, and representing 1 John v. 7. in the same manner; but what he says is very obscure; and therefore I shall not urge it.

³ Vitali in Blanchini's *Evang. Quadf.* part 1. p. 367.

the seventh verse with the eighth by the intervention of *sicut*. In three Mss. that Bp. Burnet saw, the seventh verse follows the eighth; and they are pinned together, as the bishop well expresses it, by a "*sicut*." In a Ms. at Ulme¹ the passage stands thus: *Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt, sicut in celo tres sunt pater, verbum, et spiritus, et tres unum sunt*. This various reading not only gives fresh suspicion of interpolation, but shows us the means by which it gradually insinuated itself into the text. Whoever duly and attentively weighs this circumstance, will perhaps see less cause to think the idea of a marginal gloss so "affected and absurd" as you modestly pronounce it, p. 342. But they who believe things that are impossible, generally disbelieve other things both possible and probable. We know for certain that some of the most learned and renowned fathers interpreted the spirit, the water, and the blood of the Trinity. Could all the diligent Christians who perused Augustine, Eucherius, and Facundus, with the intention of extracting explanations of Scripture, and noting them in the margin of their Bibles—could they all miss this sagacious interpretation? Would no member of the churches over which these bishops presided, approve and endeavor to perpetuate his diocesan's sublime discovery? When once such a copy existed, with a marginal note of this sort on 1 John v. 8. *Sicut tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo, pater, verbum, et spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt*; the next transcriber, in a fit of politeness, might think that if this sentence was not text, it deserved to be, and might compliment it with a place in the middle of his page. Perhaps you think it "an affected and absurd idea" that a marginal note can ever creep into the text: yet I hope you are not so ignorant as not to know that this has actually happened, not merely in hundreds or thousands, but in millions of places. "*Natura*," says Bailé,² "ita comparatum est, ut auctorum probatorum libros plerique omnes amplos quam breves malint; verentes scilicet, ne quid sibi desit, quod auctoris vel sit vel esse dicatur." To the same purpose Bengelius,³ "Non facile pro superfluo aliquid hodie habent complures docti viri, (he might have added, 'omnesque indocti,') eademque mente plerique quondam librarii fuere." From this known propensity of transcribers to turn every thing into text which they found written in the margin of their Mss. or between the lines, so many interpolations have proceeded, that at present the surest canon of criticism is, "*Praefertur lectio brevior*."

I have hitherto been arguing as if all the Latin Mss. had the

¹ Griesbach, tom. ii. p. 229. *Sicut* is also read in a Ms. of Card. Passionei.

² De Lib. supp. Dionys. et Ignat. ii. 3. p. 238

³ In Apocalypsis. i. 11.

disputed verse in some shape or other; which you know, Sir, is not the case. You say indeed, p. 210, that "there is a greater number beyond all comparison in which this text is found." I have already allowed you the full benefit of your majority. Make the most of this concession; for it would be unkind to deprive you of an advantage which you so seldom enjoy. But take care of this argument; for, if you push it too forcibly, it will pierce the heart of your own cause. If the majority of Latin copies be a good proof that this verse was early in the Latin version, the majority of Greek Mss. is as good a proof that it never was in the original. However, I will make what I think a fair proposal. Produce two actually existing Greek Mss. five hundred years old, containing this verse, and I will acknowledge your opinion of its genuineness to be probable. If you are unable to do this, and I produce you above twenty Latin Mss., all greatly exceeding that age, you cannot, I think, in common decency, refuse to be a convert to my opinion. Let us then come to the fact. There are now existing twenty-nine Latin Mss., in general the oldest, the fairest, and the most correct. Wetstein reckons twenty-five, to which Mr. Griesbach adds the Harleian, 1772, and says, "pluresque post Wetstenium inspectos." I know nothing about any of these "plures," and therefore I shall make no appeal to them. All these Mss. in 1 John v., instead of our present seventh and eighth verses, give no more than—*Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt.* In the Harleian catalogue, No. 7551 contains three copies of the First Epistle of John. The first copy seems to be of the tenth century, the second of the ninth, and both omit the heavenly witnesses. In the first copy the line, as appears from the space, originally stood thus; *sps, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt.* But another hand has erased the whole sentence, and written, *spiritus, sanguis, et aqua*, stretching out the letters to make them fill the line. In the margin is added, by the same hand, I suppose, that made the rasure, *in cœlo pater, verbum, et sps, et tres unum sunt, et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra.* After *aqua*, a third hand (unless it were the second in a repenting mood) adds, *et hi tres unum sunt.* The second copy has the genuine words without any rasure, interlineation, or marginal note. Casley, in his catalogue, p. 15. gives an account of another Latin Ms. agreeing with these as it was first written; but afterwards thus interpolated: *Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant in tra sps aqua et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt.* et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo, pater et filius, et sps sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt. The same hand has very liberally scattered cor-

1 If any of these Mss. add *in terra*, as perhaps one or two may, I am content that they be struck off the list.

rections through the rest of the book, sometimes right, but oftener false and absurd. I hope, Sir, by these instances, you will begin to perceive that it is at least possible for an interpolation sometimes to gain footing in the text. I shall trouble you with the mention of only one Latin Ms. more. Mabillon found at Lisieux, and published, a Gallic¹ Lectionary, which is reputed to be now about 1200 years old, and contains the entire Epistle of John, except the three heavenly witnesses. But these it barbarously omits, and only has, *Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt*. The authority of this Ms. cannot but be thought of great weight, if we consider its age; to which I shall add another argument in its favor: it omits (see Mabillon, p. 475.) that interpolation 1 Pet. iii. 22. from which no other Latin copy, so far as I know, is exempt.

But, to close this long discussion, the question is, To which side shall we give credit, to age or to numbers? On one side the witnesses are grave, elderly persons, who lived nearer the time when the fact happened which they assert, and they are all consistent in their testimony; while the other party, though vastly superior in numbers, yet lived too late to be competently acquainted with the cause: many carry a brand of perjury on their front; and, after all their collusion and subornation, their testimonies frequently clash, and contradict one another. In short, the few Latin Mss. that reject the verse, are as much superior to the herd of incorrect and modern copies that retain it, as a small well-trained band of soldiers to a numerous rabble destitute of discipline and unanimity.

POSTSCRIPT.

Abbot Joachim compared the final clauses of the seventh and eighth verses, whence he inferred, that the same expression ought to be interpreted in the same manner. Since, therefore, said he, nothing more than unity of testimony and consent can be meant by *tres unum sunt* in the eighth verse, nothing more than unity of testimony and consent is meant in the seventh. This opinion the Lateran council and Thomas Aquinas confuted by cutting out that clause in the eighth verse. Thomas tells us, that it was not extant in the *true copies*, but that it was *said* to be added by the Arian heretics to pervert the sound understanding of the foregoing authority. My blood boils whenever I think of those sacrilegious Arians, sometimes forging and sometimes erasing scripture. Thus Thomas Aquinas tells us, that they were “said” to have added this clause. Bugebagius thinks they inserted the whole seventh verse. Yet some part of my indignation is involuntarily diverted

¹ Twells and Bengelius, by a strange mistake, affirm that this Lectionary was not written in Latin, but in Gallo-Teutonic.

to the holy fathers of the church, who seem to have been in a sleep approaching to a lethargy, while the enemy came and sowed the tares. In taking the method above mentioned, the Lateran council, it is true, followed Dr. Ovid's advice, "*impedibile vulnus Ense recidendum, ne pars sincera trahatur.*" But if they had given their minds to good reading, they would have found in the treatise against Varimadus an easy way of curing the wound that Joachim had made in the common faith, without having recourse to the desperate process of amputation. For the author of that treatise, as if he had foreseen, and meant to confound, the stratagems of the Arians, thus quotes the passage from "the Epistle to the Parthians;" "There are three that bear record on earth, the water, the blood, and THE FLESH, and the three are IN US; and there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and they three are one." What would then have become of Joachim's argument?

LETTER VII.

Of the Syriac and Coptic Versions.

Sir,

You will perhaps accuse me of a capital neglect, in not taking notice of your argument from the Prologue attributed to Jerome, the author of which boasts to have restored¹ this verse from Greek Mss. I confess that I was rather doubtful in what class of proofs I should place the Prologue; but at last I thought it more properly belonged to the head of quotations. I shall therefore treat of it in my review of the *pious* Jerome. In the mean time, the next versions on our list are the Syriac and Coptic, which I intend to make the joint subjects of this letter. You and Martin find the testimony of these versions so unfavorable to your cause, that you are resolved, at all events, to demolish their authority. But the heat of a prejudiced accuser often hurts himself more than the party accused!. Your eagerness to disable the credit of the Syriac and Coptic versions has so utterly deprived you of judgment and reflection, that I am not without some hopes of making an impression on your own head or heart:

————— for so I shall,

If they be made of penetrable stuff;

If damned custom have not braz'd them so,

'That they be proof and bulwark against sense.

I shall not dispute with you about the precise age of the old

¹ Mr. Travis quarrels with the word "restored," p. 51. 105. "because," says he, "the verse was never lost." Surely an editor may be said to "restore" a passage, that was only in a part of the copies, and consequently, in danger of being lost.

Syriac version. I have several reasons for this forbearance ; one of which is, that I know very little of the matter. I shall only observe, that your argument against its being older than Chrysostome, because it contains the doxology, is not valid, unless you allow that the doxology is spurious. If you allow this, you reject a reading that has, on a moderate computation, thirty times as many witnesses in its behalf, as your present client. It is found in all the Greek Mss. except eight ; in two of the oldest Latin copies ; in some Mss. of the Arabic and Persic ; in the Syriac, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Æthiopic. If you had a sixth part of this evidence for 1• John v. 7. how you would triumph over all that dared even to insinuate the smallest suspicion ! But you despise the aid of external evidence. It is the nature of the texts and the doctrines supposed to be contained in them that permits or forbids omissions to be conclusive arguments. If I had a mind to argue in your way, I could say, that only a single version, the Coptic, is found, which uniformly omits the doxology ; “that this version is faulty beyond belief, leaving out many whole verses ; and that no argument can be drawn from any omission of any verse, by any transcriber, like this :” p. 90. 196.

I now come to your arguments against these obnoxious versions ; which, as they are of the same kind, I beg leave to consolidate. “They are,” you say, p. 87—90. 190—196. “faulty and incorrect, almost beyond belief. They pass over not words or sentences only, but even whole verses, which are admitted by all to be genuine.” The instances of this sort which you produce from the Syriac, are John xiv. 3. xvi. 14. Acts viii. 37. xv. 34. xxviii. 29. 1 Pet. iv. 14. You might have strengthened this argument by an observation which I have seen, that this version omits whole epistles, and therefore might easily omit a short sentence of a single epistle. If you think this objection of any weight, you are welcome to the use of it. Your instances of omission from the Coptic are, Matth. v. 14. xviii. 1. xx. 22, 23. xxvii. 35. Mark vii. 16. xi. 26. Acts viii. 37. xxiv. 7. To save your readers the trouble of looking for the places, and the fear of being deceived by any misprint in the numbers of reference, you have courteously transcribed the entire passages. But, before I go farther in this subject, I request you, Sir, to answer the following queries :

1. Are you sure, from your own inspection, that the Syriac and Coptic versions are chargeable with these omissions ?
2. Do all the Mss. of this or that version agree in rejecting the verses specified ? For, if the Mss. vary, some retaining and some omitting a passage, it is absurd to blame that for a fault in the version itself, which may be corrected from better copies.
3. Do they omit the whole quantity of text that you have transcribed ?
4. How do you know that these passages are admitted by all

to be genuine? Have you had the patience to collect the opinions of all who have written on these subjects? Or do you believe that every syllable of our common Greek Testament, as it was settled in the year 1624 by Elzevir and other inspired men, is the genuine text of the Evangelists and Apostles?

Leaving you to chew the cud on these queries, I shall proceed to consider a few of these passages.

"Matth. v. 44. is entirely left out of the Coptic."—Let us then transcribe the context without this verse, and see what excellent sense it will make.

43. *Ye have heard that, it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy;*

45. *That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, &c.*

Strange, that the reason of a precept should be given, and the precept itself not appear! Notwithstanding your "evidence" to command our full assent when you only affirm a plain fact, which you are completely competent to ascertain," p. 59. 126; notwithstanding my own "literary candor and Christian charity," I assure you, Sir, that sooner than believe such an absurdity of the Coptic, I should have the audacity to charge you with "strange misapprehension."

Matth. xxvii. 35.—Is this whole verse, too, Sir, wanting in the Coptic? If it be, I will own such a version to be of very little value, and shall make no difficulty of delivering it up to your resentment. But when I consider that, if the verse be expunged, there will remain no direct mention of Christ's crucifixion, I cannot believe that either translator or transcriber could in his most careless mood overlook so important a sentence.

Throw out Matth. xviii. 1. xx. 22, 23. John xvi. 14. the sense indeed will not be totally destroyed, but the construction will appear abrupt and unconnected. In Acts xxiv. 7. whoever will cast his eye on the Greek text will see that your account cannot be true, for the eighth verse begins with *κελεύσας*, which, if the seventh verse be omitted, will have no substantive to govern it.

Thus far I have thought fit to take the high *priori* road of reasoning; that if I have any attentive readers (besides your friend Kuster), they may learn to weigh the probabilities of an assertion before they agree to its truth, and to distrust all inconsistent relations, however solemnly vouched by the relater.—

Σωφρονος δ' ἀπιστίας

Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χρησιμώτερον βροτοῖς.

I shall now, Sir, descend to the level of your understanding, to the plain fact. I assert then that the Syriac version omits only three whole verses of the six you have been pleased to quote: Acts viii. 37. xv. 34. xxviii. 29. Of your eight examples from

the Coptic, you are right only in three; Mark vii. 16. xi. 26. Acts viii. 37. However, I shall be merciful to you in your last instance, Acts xxiv. 7. because you are seldom guilty of asserting too little. For the Coptic version there omits not only the whole seventh verse, but parts also of the sixth and eighth.

John xiv. 3. xvi. 14. the later Syriac editions represent exactly as they are in the Greek. Widmanstad and Tremellius indeed omit the former part of one (*And if I go and prepare a place for you*), and the latter part of the other (*And shall show it unto you*); but in Guido's edition both these clauses are replaced from a Ms. 1 Pet. iv. 14. the Syriac only omits, *On their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.*

Matth. v. 44. the Coptic thus shortens: *But I say unto you, love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you.* xviii. 1. the Coptic does not omit, nor any other version, nor any Greek Ms. that I can find. Instead of xviii. 1. you ought to have written xviii. 11. which the Coptic does omit. xx. 22, 23. In each of these verses the Coptic only omits the words, *and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.* xxvii. 35. the Coptic omits the application of the prophecy, and only retains, *And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots.*

Thus, Sir, in your fourteen examples you have made eight mistakes. Will you accept of my corrections? The list will not be much lessened in number, for there will then remain twelve examples; but several of them will be of less consequence. These twelve examples amount only to eleven passages; Acts viii. 37. being twice quoted. Are then these eleven passages admitted by all, as you affirm, to be genuine? You must correct again, Sir. This general assertion of yours contains in effect eleven separate assertions, and in ten of them you are wrong. Eight times Mill approves the shorter reading; two of the other omissions are patronised, one by Erasmus, and one by Bengelius; nay, Whitby himself, who "put in the front of his book that splendid falsehood THAT THE VULGAR READING MAY BE ALWAYS DEFENDED," agrees to expunge Matth. xxvii. 35. Three of your genuine passages Mr. Griesbach has discarded from his text; Matth. xxi. 22, 23. xxvii. 35. Acts viii. 37. and on six more he sets a mark to render them doubtful; Matth. v. 44. xviii. 11. Acts xv. 34. xxiv. 6—8. xxviii. 29. 1 Pet. iv. 14.

Let us now inquire into the merits of some of these readings. In Matth. v. 44. the sense is the same, whether we acquiesce in the received reading, or prefer the shorter reading which has the Coptic and other authorities on its side. It is a mere point of criticism to decide whether the sentence was first abridged by the

¹ Valckenaer. Orat. de Critica in N. T. non adhibenda, p. 308.

haste of copiers, or lengthened by the admission of the parallel passage, Luke vi. 27, 28. To me, I own, the latter opinion seems more plausible.

Matth. xviii. 11. is omitted not only in the Coptic version, but in six Greek Mss. one very ancient Latin copy, one Ms. of the Syriac quoted by Professor J. G. C. Adler,¹ nor is it mentioned by Origen, Jerome, &c. Many Greek Mss. the Æthiopic, Arabic, and latter Syriac versions add *Ἐπὶ ἡμῶν καὶ*; a circumstance which makes it more than probable that the whole verse is interpolated from Luke xix. 10. In like manner many copies of Matth. xxiv. 36. have a clause added from Mark xiii. 32.

In Mark vii. 16. though no more than four Greek Mss. agree with the Coptic, I cannot but subscribe to Mill's judgment, who thinks it spurious. What confirms me the more in this opinion is, that the transcribers of the Greek Mss. have in other places been very prone to stuff out the text with the same sentence. Not contented with its having quiet and acknowledged possession in Matth. xi. 15. xiii. 9. Mark iv. 9, &c. a great number of Mss. adds it in Matth. xiii. 23. xxv. 30. Luke xii. 21. xxi. 4. In Mark xi. 26. several of the Greek Mss. agree with the Coptic.

The rest of the omissions which you lay to the charge of these versions are supported by so many considerable authorities, that whoever ventures to decide positively against them, will incur the imputation of great rashness. And what is remarkable enough is, that they all have the concurrence of at least some Latin Mss. By this time I hope the intelligent reader will perceive, that, in fact, there is not, among all the instances you have brought to prove the Syriac and Coptic versions faulty, above one or two that can reasonably be pronounced corrupt; and, that in the rest they rather create a prejudice against the luxuriance of the common reading, than the common reading against their frugality.

But "though it was greatly your duty, it was no part of your design," p. 71. 157. to say what might be said in favor of these versions. The unlearned reader therefore is left to suppose that one or the other of these versions is so incorrect, as in many important instances to stand single, and contradict the united authority of the Greek Mss., the other versions, and the citations of the fathers. It is curious, too, that of the passages you produce, you only note the agreement of the Syriac and Coptic in one omission, whereas they really agree in five. And I cannot but condemn your imprudence in mentioning even that single instance of their agreement, Acts viii. 37. It might awaken the suspicions of some inquisitive reader, who by this glimmering of light would perhaps be led to a farther examination of the subject, and consequently to a detection of Mr. Travis's errors. I shall only add, that where-

¹ De Syriacis Versionibus.

ever the Syriac and Coptic versions agree in any deviation from the common reading (be it alteration, addition, or omission), and that deviation is countenanced by a reasonable number of Greek Mss. it will require better critical abilities than yours to prove them in the wrong.

"These are examples," you add concerning the Syriac, "which have escaped even the critical eye of Theodore Beza." How lucky that they escaped not the critical eye of Mr. Travis! But if Beza was so purblind as not to see such manifest omissions, with a Latin translation from the Syriac before him, I assure you, Sir, without flattery, that your eye is at least as critical as his. When you have read a little more concerning this subject than you have already, that is, when you have read at all, you will find that Beza does actually mention four of these six examples; John xiv. 3. Acts viii. 37. xxviii. 29. 1 Pet. iv. 14.

I feel myself here treading on slippery ground. When I reflect on the heinousness of the charge that I have brought against you, I am almost afraid of being myself suspected for a false accuser. There is one advantage in telling enormous rather than moderate falsehoods. Mankind are in general so lazy and credulous, that when once they are prejudiced in favor of any person's veracity, they will regard another as a calumniator who endeavors to convince them that they have bestowed their approbation on an unworthy object. They will argue, as I have already observed, from the enormity of an offence, and the easiness of detection, against the probability of its ever being committed.

But if I shall be fortunate enough to have one reader of learning and probity, I request him, I exhort him, to peruse this letter, and the other passages where I pawn my own word, with particular attention. He will then find that I have stated the facts simply as they are, and that however astonishing the instances of Mr. Travis's assurance may seem, I have spoken of them without distortion or exaggeration.

I should indeed have almost distrusted the evidence of my own senses, when I saw you commit above twenty gross and palpable errors in less than half a dozen pages, if I had not been acquainted with the source from which they flowed. Your French friend Martin¹ makes a few mistakes, which you, like a true Englishman, have greatly improved. Martin says, Diss. p. 166. (91 Eng.) "This Syriac version is full of faults, and especially of omissions. Beza has given abundance of instances—and we could add thereto a great many others—I shall give only a few, and those in

¹ Mr. Travis may perhaps allege in his defence, that he refers to Martin in the bottom of his page 88. 192. This is true; but I would defy any reader to guess from so slight and naked a reference that he had borrowed the substance of five pages from Martin.

whole texts." He then specifies the very same verses which you have quoted (except that you have omitted one of his examples); but because he was content to mark the number's without reciting the words, you set down the whole verses without inquiry. To the Coptic he makes the same objection, and gives for examples of omissions the same numbers with which you have obliged us. But by ill luck, instead of Matth. xviii. 11. his printer, by overlooking a figure, made it xviii. 1. Now if Martin had been less sparing of his ink and labor, he would have written the passages at full length, and saved his admirer the disgrace of this ridiculous plagiarism. How very rude too was it to express himself so ambiguously, "Beza has given abundance of instances—and we could add thereto a great many others." If you look at these words again, you may perceive, Sir, unless "some devil has cozened you at hoodman-blind," that they do not necessarily imply all the instances there given to be such as had "escaped the critical eye of Theodore Beza."

There is another little circumstance which you have not condescended to mention. Besides the copies of the ancient Syriac version, commonly called the *Versio Simplex*, there came to England in this century a copy of Philoxenus's version, revised by Thomas Heracleensis, and collated in the margin with the old Syriac and several Greek Mss. The margin and text of this revision so often make additions, that if the collator had found the three heavenly witnesses in any Ms., Syriac or Greek, he would not have envied his readers the valuable discovery. Yet this villainous copy is obstinately silent both in the text and in the margin. The same malignant demon¹ that has preserved the Dublin Ms. to mock at human credulity, seems to have brought to light this new Syriac version to abet the Arians in their impious opposition.

"Accipe nunc Danaum insidias." In the year 1599, Menezes, archbishop of Goa, presided at the Synod of Diamper, and made the Indian Christians correct their Syriac copies by the Latin version. Among the passages thus judiciously corrected, 1 John v. 7.² could not fail to be included. This the archbishop ordered to be restored, as "having been suppressed by impiety." Tremellius, not finding this passage either in Widmanstad's edition or the Heidelberg Ms., ventured not to insert it in his text, but translates it into Syriac in the margin, and says, "sic restitui possit." At last Gutbier boldly thrusts it into the text, and tells us that the Arians expunged it. Schaaf could not help applauding so good an example. "This verse," says he, "is wanting in the former

¹ Journ. Brit. tom. ix. p. 64.

² La Croze, *Christianisme des Indes*, iii. p. 342.

editions, but Gutbier and I have transcribed it from Tremellius's notes and inserted it in the text." Schaaf afterwards sent a copy of his edition to the bishop of the Malabarian Christians of St. Thomas. The bishop in return sent him a Syriac Ms. of the N. T. This "treasure of inestimable value" is still preserved in the Amsterdam library, and contains that precious jewel, the cause of so much strife and shedding of ink. With what face will the infidels now assert that the Syriac version omits the three heavenly witnesses, when a Syriac Ms. confirms their authenticity? Perhaps they will make two trifling objections; 1. That this Ms. was written as late as the year 1700, and therefore is too modern to have any authority; especially as we know that the Syriac copies had been interpolated with this very text a century before. 2. That in this Ms. the verse is written thus in the margin, *in cælo pater et filius, et spiritus sanctus, et hi tres in uno sunt. Et sunt tres testes in terra.* But you, Sir, who are as well pleased with margin as with text, and with Dublin or Berlin Mss. as with Alexandrian or Vatican, will despise such arguments, and manfully defend the credit of your witness. I hope, however, that some who have formerly entertained sublime notions of the morality of the Complutensian and other editors, will on reflection abate of their confidence, and acknowledge that when a man is (no matter how) convinced of the genuineness of any reading, he will not be so scrupulous as to throw it out of his text merely because his Mss. chance to be re-fractory. In particular, the zeal and eagerness that have been shown for the establishment of this verse, sometimes on very slender authority and sometimes on none, may serve to check the wonder of those readers, who are apt to put implicit trust in the professions of editors.

I must not forget a gentle censure of La Croze's on the Syriac version, that "respectable as it is, by having been retouched several times, the copies have many variations, and that it does not deserve quite so much credit as it has commonly obtained." But this observation, however it may detract from the general authority of the version, rather strengthens than weakens its evidence in the present case. For since many Greek interpolations have been admitted from time to time into the Syriac, its constant omission of this verse in the successive collations of Greek Mss. proves that the verse was uniformly absent from the early Syriac version and the Greek copies on which the later translation was formed.

To conclude, the Mss. of the Coptic version unanimously, the old Syriac version, and the later version made by Philoxenus and collated again with Greek Mss. and the former Syriac by Thomas Heraclensis, are three strong and distinct evidences against the

¹ Adler de Syriacis Versionibus, p. 31—33.

² Christianisme d'Ethiopie, t. p. 40.

authenticity of 1 John v. 7. The Syriac Mss. protested against it till the end of the sixteenth century, when the copies of such owners as were obedient to the conscientious Menezes began to be adulterated in compliance with his orders. With equal judgment and fidelity some of the Syriac editors have admitted this verse into their text, without the slightest authority, but merely from a marginal note of Immanuel Tremellius.

But whatever weight these versions may be thought to have in the decision of the present question, every attentive reader must see and confess that Mr. Travis is a servile copier and a hardy assertor. I shall therefore dismiss him to the contempt of the learned, and the reproaches of his own conscience.

LETTER VIII.

Of the Arabic, Æthiopic, Armenian, and Slavonic Versions.

Sir,

The remaining versions to which Dr. Benson appeals, are the Arabic, the Æthiopic, the Persic, the Armenian, the Russian, and the old French. By the old French version I suppose him to mean the Gallic Lectionary published by Mabillon, of which I gave an account in my sixth letter. I frankly consent to exclude this from the number of versions. I have only produced it as a copy of the Latin version, though for a single authority I lay great stress on it. The Persic, which Martin seems generously to yield to his opposers, Dr. Benson accepts, and you acquiesce in his claim. If there really be in print such a Persic version containing the Catholic Epistles, I must take shame to myself, and confess my ignorance; comforting myself, however, that Mill, Wetstein, Mr. Griesbach, and others, seem to be as ignorant as I am. To the Arabic and Æthiopic you object, because they are copied, according to Simon and Dupin, from the Syriac. But in the note, p. 193. you tell us, that Renaudot deduces the Æthiopic, and Michaelis some of the Arabic versions, from the Coptic. The solution of this question must be left to the curious in Oriental languages. Perhaps those learned men were hasty in their judgments, and founded their sentiments on a partial conformity. Perhaps both these versions were made from Greek Mss. though the Mss. might have a general likeness to those which were used by the compilers of the Syriac and Coptic. At any rate, amidst these jarring opinions, it will be impossible to make a well-grounded choice, till more accurate editions are published from Arabic and Æthiopic Mss.

But not caring to talk learnedly without understanding the subject (though that is a very common fault, as you, Sir, no doubt, have observed), I shall not press this argument; nor assume a point in my own favor, merely because it cannot be proved against me. I shall only use the concurrent testimony of these two versions as an argument for the consistency of their parents. If

the disputed verse had been once in the Coptic or Syriac, and was afterwards lost out of the later copies, it might have been preserved in the Æthiopic or Arabic from early and uncorrupted Mss. But since these too omit it, the agreement of the Syriac and Coptic versions is strengthened by a fresh accession of evidence.

Having thus dispatched the Arabic and Æthiopic versions, we come to the Armenian, which La Croze¹ has dignified with the august title of “Queen of Versions.” But, alas!

— Kings, queens, and states,
Maids, matrons, nay, the secrets of the grave,
This viperous slander enters.

For a king and a bishop (Haitho and Uscan), who were intrusted with the education of this *queen*, have been accused of sullyng the purity which they ought to have protected. This slander had gained ground on the report of Simon, Sandius, and La Croze; and the world in general seemed disposed to believe it; when a champion entered the lists, and with more than a Quixote's gallantry threw down his gauntlet in behalf of injured innocence.

* En quoi certes et sa bonté,
Et son zèle et sa charité,
Se firent d'autant plus paroître,
Qu'il n'a l'honneur de la connoître;
Semblable à ces preux chevaliers,
Ces Paladins aventuriers,
Qui, défendant des Inconnues,
Ont porté leur nom jusqu'aux nues.

You will perhaps, Sir, interrupt this railery by asking me, whether I understand the Armenian language? Truly, Sir, no better than yourself. But that I know something more of the subject than you, I will endeavor to convince my readers. We are happily agreed that Uscan published this version, and that it contains 1 John v. 7. You add indeed, “without any mark of doubt or suspicion.” You are very fond, I perceive, of these expletives. Has any other passage of Uscan's Bible any mark of doubt or suspicion? If not, what consequence can be drawn from his silence on this place? For my own part, not having your heroic talent for assertion, I cannot positively affirm, but I fully believe that Uscan has spared himself all trouble of that kind.² Your next arguments cannot have justice done them, without being more largely transcribed.

“1. Michaelis affirms, on the authority of Sandius, that Uscan

¹ Beausobre and Lenfant's Pref. to N. T. p. 211. Whiston's Pref. to Moses Chorenensis, p. 9.

² Bengelius, who says on Apoc. xiii. 5. that Uscan prints his additions in a different character, mistook the edition of 1698 for Uscan's.

did not find the passage 1 John v. 7. in his Ms. although it stands in Uscan's editions.

"But the account so given by Sandius, was 'evidently (to say the least of it) a mistake. [*Anglicè*, was evidently a lie.] For M. Simon was acquainted at Paris with Uscan, whilst he was employed in executing his important commission. And M. Simon (who was not only a very learned, but on the whole a candid opponent of this verse) expressly admits, that Uscan's impression could not but be very accurate. 'The bishop (says he), who was a judicious and discreet person, brought with him the most correct Mss. which he carefully followed. And these particulars I learned from the bishop himself.'"

Here, Sir, your fidelity in copying Martin's translator has let you into a small error. You ought to have divided Simon's words into two quotations. But if a translator will omit *ailleurs*, who can help it?—This, however, you call the confession of an adversary, overthrowing his own prepossessions. To make this a complete confession, and a counterpoise to the evidence of Sandius, Simon ought to have seen Uscan's Ms. or Mss. with his own eyes, and to have testified that he there read the disputed verse. But he only says that the bishop brought with him good Mss. which he faithfully followed. We cannot erect this into a testimony, unless we know also, that Simon examined the Mss., compared them with Uscan's edition, and found them to agree. But this we know he did not, because he confesses, in another place, that he learned these particulars from the bishop's own mouth. Thus Simon's confession, that was to work such wonders in favor of the verse, shrinks into the solitary declaration of an editor. The bubble that we admired at a distance, and pursued with eagerness, vanishes into air the instant we touch it. Bengelius would have said (what he has said in effect) of the Complutensian editors, that they had good Mss. and followed them faithfully. And I myself would say the same of other editors. But Bengelius allows that the Complutensian editors had not this verse in their Mss. And if any person should take advantage of my general expressions, that an edition was published from Mss., and argue that therefore it faithfully followed the Mss. in this or that particular passage, I should begin to be in pain for the state of his intellects. Still less credit is to be given to the interested professions of a publisher. But you suppose men who commend the goods which they expose to sale, to have as nice a conscience as if they were taking an oath in a court of justice. Thus Erasmus's encomium on Jerome you gravely bring, p. 253—255. as a contradiction to his less flattering opinion. Erasmus was a great, and on the whole an honest man, though, like other editors, he sometimes descended to practise the tricks of the trade. Nobody else believes half the praises that he heaps on Jerome, nor did he himself believe them all.

But supposing that Simon really made this confession which you have extorted from his words, how does his testimony disagree with Sandius's? Sandius says,¹ that an Armenian Ms. 400 years old, which he saw in possession of the bishop of the Armenian church at Amsterdam, omitted 1 John v. 7. You, Sir, I suppose, will not only allow, but insist, that Uscan had more than one Ms. of the Catholic Epistles. If he had two, one containing, the other rejecting the verse, who can doubt that he would have placed it in his text, and thought himself obeying the laws of sound criticism? "*Præferatur lectio plenior et magis orthodoxa*" would be his canon, especially when the common editions of the Latin, the only version that he understood, would confirm him in his decision. If therefore the Armenian Mss. varied in this place, Sandius's testimony is not contradicted either by Simon's acknowledgment or by Uscan's professions.

But Simon, Sir, makes no such acknowledgment. In the very letter of his, which you have quoted without seeing, Simon observes that the three heavenly witnesses were indeed in Uscan's edition, but adds, that Uscan, knowing something of Latin, probably borrowed them from the Vulgate to enrich his edition. This conjecture of Simon's receives some color from La Croze's information, that Uscan confesses in one of his prefaces, with seeming complacency, that he altered some things from the Vulgate. But this proves nothing in your opinion, "because Uscan makes no such confession respecting 1 John v. 7." I am not violently disposed to accuse Uscan² of the interpolation. I only mention this as a specimen of your masterly reasoning. Uscan says that he added some things from the Vulgate. He specifies none. Therefore he did not add this. I answer, that whatever passage be suspected, you will always have the same reason at your beck. For Uscan makes no confession respecting any passage. Therefore he has altered none, and of course tells a lie when he says that he has. Excellent logician! But I am ashamed of such trifling.

In the thirteenth century the Armenian church became intimate with the Roman. Haitho in particular was much devoted to it, and tolerably acquainted with the Latin language. In preparing a new edition of the Bible, it was impossible for him to neglect the authority of a church with which he had contracted so close a friendship. A clear proof of his reverence for his spiritual ally, is, that he translated all the prefaces attributed to Jerome, and among them the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles. When therefore Haitho borrowed this Prologue, which complains of unfaithful translators, and pretends to restore the heavenly witnesses from

¹ Append. Interpret. Paradox. p. 376.

² If Uscan be really guilty of this insertion, the passages in the acts of the council are probably corrupted by Galanus.

Greek Mss., how could he resist the testimony of Jerome, and, as far as he knew, the uniform authority of the Latin church? If the Armenian version was before his time defective in this important passage, he was bound on such weighty reasons to patch up the flaw. You say, "that Haitho's translating Jerome's prefaces does not prove that this verse was not in the Armenian Mss. before he was born." True; it does not entirely prove it. But it proves, that if this verse was not in the Armenian Mss. of that age, he would have taken it from the Vulgate, and added it to his own edition. That this verse was not in the Armenian Mss. of that age, appears from the testimony of Sandius concerning the only Ms. known to be of that age. The testimony of Sandius is, 1. not contradicted by Simon's confession, for Simon confesses nothing, but that Uscan told him that he had brought Armenian Mss. from which he printed his edition; nor, 2. is it contradicted by Uscan's own practice: for though Uscan has really inserted this verse in his edition, he might do this on the authority of one or some only of his Mss. and not of all; and yet he would then have acted up to his own ideas of fidelity, and agreeably to the custom of editors. Nor, 3. is this testimony of Sandius at all improbable in itself; for there is no difficulty in conceiving that an Armenian Ms. should agree with all the Greek Mss. extant, with the Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Æthiopic, Slavonic versions, with more than twenty of the oldest Latin Mss. &c.

You next produce a confession from Michaelis, that this verse is quoted thirty-seven years after Haitho's death by an Armenian council. This, Sir, I acknowledge; and you ought to acknowledge in your turn the generosity of the adversaries; for La Croze first discovered¹ these passages. It may likewise be added to the advantage of La Croze's candor, that having at first suspected Uscan himself of the interpolation, he confessed his mistake. He found Uscan's edition agreeing with the Vulgate in adding passages of which no traces were visible in an Armenian Ms. at Berlin. And by comparing this circumstance with Uscan's confession, that he had altered some things from the Vulgate, he inferred, that Uscan had inserted 1 John v. 7. solely in compliance with the Vulgate. But this opinion he retracted on finding the foregoing quotations.

From these passages you argue, that, if the verse had been restored by Haitho, the members of the council would certainly have given some note to inform the reader that it had once been lost, and now was restored; or have made some acknowledgement to the memory of Haitho for its restoration. How long, Sir, must a new edition of the Bible be published, before it is lawful to quote it for scripture? The members of the council busied themselves,

¹ So Le Long first told the public, that the verse was found in the Dublin Ms.

no doubt, in scrupulously marking the passages in which the old version differed from Haitho's! In our English Bibles, this very sentence was once marked as suspicious. I forget the precise year in which it was made free of the text. Would not a common Christian, nay, perhaps the clergy in convocation, if they quoted this verse the next year, probably quote it without troubling themselves about the history of its insertion? The greater part of mankind, even those who call themselves literary men, scarcely ever examine critically the passages which they occasionally quote. They take them from the edition that first occurs, or sometimes from another writer, on whose good faith they repose. (Of the truth of this position you, Sir, are a woful proof.) It was natural then that an edition of the Bible published by a king and a saint should in thirty-seven years become authentic. The person who drew up the account of the proceedings in council, might not possess, might not even have seen, a copy of the former edition. And though he did know that the passage was otherwise read in the older Mss. his orthodoxy, his natural propensity to the ampler reading, his respect for the piety, erudition and dignity of the deceased editor, would induce him to adopt the emendation. But were the writers of those days so exceedingly addicted to criticism, that they admitted no scriptural quotation into their works, without a full inquiry into its claims to be read in this or that manner? Did the members of those assemblies nicely weigh the authorities, and verify the citations, produced by each other? In the present age, which is infinitely more learned and critical than either the thirteenth or the fourteenth century, I question whether every reader or writer gives himself this trouble. Some persons of high rank, Sir, it is said, have given your book great praises; have approved your reasonings, and subscribed to your conclusion. Have they all diligently examined your facts and your quotations? It is with pain I pronounce, that this question cannot be answered in the affirmative. In short, your argument is built on two assumptions: 1. The council ought to have mentioned the various reading, if there had been one. 2. The council acted exactly as it ought to have acted, and therefore would have mentioned the various reading, if there had been one. But I have been informed, that the latter rule is sometimes deceitful. Neither perhaps did the council know of the obligation that Mr. Travis has lately imposed on them.

All this while, the reader must needs suppose, from what you have said, that the council quotes this verse to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, or some branch of it; or at least to apply the words in some manner or other. How will he be surprised to learn, that though indeed this verse is thrice transcribed in the Councils, p. 436. 461. 478. in none of the three places is the slightest use made of it, nor any kind of reference to it in the sequel. What

need then had the compiler of the Acts of the Council to quit his subject for an impertinent digression? Suppose that an English divine, soon after our translation had received its last correction, writing on the nature of Antichrist, thus quoted the present Epistle, ii. 23. *Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father also.* Would it be worth his while to stop and inform his readers, that the second part of this verse was once wanting in our translation, or to make an acknowledgement to the church for having restored it? It is of small consequence whether a writer quotes a doubtful part of Scripture or not, if he takes care to argue only from what is genuine. Nobody therefore, unless he were very critically inclined, would waste his time in explaining why he preferred one reading to another, of a passage which he barely quoted, without intending to employ it in his argument. But let us examine the passages. The last I shall quote at length, p. 478: "*Etsi verum illud esse fateri debemus, quod licet duo ista in se corruptibilia sint, in dominicæ tamen dispensationis sacramento mystice sumpta purissima et ab omni sunt corruptelæ contagio remississima, eandemque cum Spiritu sancto purificantem vim et operationem sibi vendicant, quocirca magnus Apostolus ille Joannes in quadam ex Catholicis suis epistolis ait: (1 John v. 7, 8. exactly as in the Vulgate :) Vide ut tria hæc unam eandemque vim retinent; nam licet diversa secundum se, virtute tamen et operatione unum quid sunt divinum et purificans: baptismum enim præ se ferunt; aqua quidem juxta illud, Ego baptizo vos aqua; sanguis vero secundum id; Calicem quem ego bibo, bibetis, et baptismo, quo ego baptizor, baptizabimini; sanguinem hic intelligens: Spiritus denique juxta illud, Ipse vos baptizabit in Spiritu sancto et igni.*" —The other two are exactly to the same purpose, and prove, from the water and the blood in the eighth verse, that water ought to be mixed with the sacramental wine. In this case there are three possibilities: 1. The council might quote these words from Haitho's version; or, 2. The copiers of the Acts, or, 3. Galanus himself might insert them. Whoever thinks that Uscan added 1 John v. 7. without the warrant of any Ms. may adopt the latter supposition. But though I should not accuse the copiers or Galanus of forgery, if I chose to defend the second or the third supposition, yet to show my fairness, and to shorten the dispute, I will be content with the first. Nothing however can be concluded thence, but that this verse was already extant in the Mss. used by the council. They might not know when or by what means it gained its situation. Or if they knew, it would have been worse than useless to have broken the thread of their discourse for so foreign a topic. They sent for an old acquaintance, whose help they wanted. He came, and brought with him a genteel young stranger. They gave the stranger a polite invitation, which he as

politely accepted. In all this there is nothing extraordinary. It is the daily practice of mankind.

But we have not yet done with this "Queen of Versions." For "one Nikon, an Armenian, published a treatise '*De pessima Religione Armeniorum*,' in which he accused his countrymen of having interpolated their Bibles in Luke xxii. 43, 44. and diverse other texts; but he brought no charge against them concerning the verse now in debate; which is a proof that it anciently was, as it now is, found in that version."

I did intend to examine this proposition as minutely as some of the former, but I find it necessary to abridge. The errors thicken so much, that I am afraid of writing a folio instead of an octavo. I shall therefore state the facts as concisely as I can. If I had read your sentence with implicit belief, I should have supposed, that Nikon wrote after the date of Uscau's edition; that he produced a long catalogue of passages besides Luke xxii. 43, 44. where it was interpolated, but was silent on 1 John v. 7. But as I knew something of Nikon, and something too of Mr. Travis, I was sure that all you told us could not be true.

This Nikon, according to Fabricius,¹ was a monk of the tenth century. La Croze² and Beausobre,³ who call him a *Greek impostor*, seem to think him a different person. However, Greek impostor or not, he lived long before the age of printing, and at least earlier, I suppose, than the time of Haitho. His treatise '*De pessima Religione Armeniorum*' is extant in Latin,⁴ but imperfect. It has been since published complete by Cotelerius⁵ from two Greek Mss. In small Greek print this important treatise takes up about—two-thirds of a folio page. Neither does Nikon accuse the Armenians of interpolating, but of erasing. Neither does he accuse them of corrupting "Luke xxii. 43, 44. and *diverse* other passages," but only one besides, John viii. f—11. If Nikon's copy had 1 John v. 7. and he knew that the Armenian Mss. omitted it, in so short a treatise, where he is content with two examples, he might not have thought it necessary to record a third. If his copy omitted and the Armenian Mss. retained it, he might be silent for the same reason; or he might not be equally severe on additions, or he might think that they preserved the genuine text, and that his own copy was corrupt. But if, as we maintain, neither Nikon nor his contemporary Armenians knew of this verse, how could he reproach them either with omitting or interpolating a sentence, that never existed in Greek or Armenian till the thirteenth century?

¹ Biblioth. Gr. vol. x. p. 283.

² Hist. du Christianisme d'Arménie, p. 333.

³ Biblioth. Germanique, tom. xxxix. p. 40.

⁴ Beveridge, Not. in Can. Concil. Trull. p. 158.

⁵ Patr. Apostol. tom. i. p. 235.

In all this, Sir, I am ready to acquit you of fraud, except so far as it is a fraud to profess knowlege where you are most ignorant. You copy Martin and his references from the English translation. This appears from your saying "diverse other passages" (*plussieurs*) instead of "another." Having drawn out this article to an unconscionable length, I shall sum it up in a few words. The ancient Armenian Mss. omitted the three heavenly witnesses. But in the thirteenth century the Romish and Armenian churches became intimate. Haitho, king of Armenia, understood Latin, and was a diligent reader of the Vulgate. Perhaps from this circumstance he first formed the design of making a new edition of the Scriptures in his own language. However, from the Vulgate he translated all the prefaces attributed to Jerome, and inserted them in his own edition. He could not be so inattentive to the advice of a (supposed) critic and saint, not to restore, as he would think it, this valuable verse to its place. Thirty-seven years after Haitho's death, the council of Armema (perhaps) quoted it, but in company with the eighth verse. And it is the eighth verse only that concerns their argument. They prove from the earthly witnesses, that the wine of the Eucharist ought to be diluted with water. Three hundred years after Haitho, Bishop Uschan inserted the seventh verse in his edition. But that it has been uniformly in the Armenian Mss. from the time of Chrysostome, because it has been in them since the union of the Latin and Armenian churches, is as likely as that it has been uniformly in the Greek Mss. because it has been quoted by some Greek writers since the Greek translation of the Lateran council.

I have already asserted, in this letter, that the Slavonic version omits 1 John v. 7. I find, on reading a little farther in your book, that you have asserted the contrary. That I may know, whether I ought to defend or retract my opinion, I shall examine your reasons, which are two, I think, one presumptive,¹ and one positive. Your presumptive proof stands thus: "The Russians, at the close of the tenth century, were converted by the Greeks, from whom they received the Scriptures. But it has been proved that the *ancient* Greek church acknowledged this verse to be genuine. Therefore the Russian or *modern* Greek church acknowledged it to be genuine." Your positive proof stands thus: "This verse possesses its place in all the Russian New Testaments, and in the Russian confession of faith, drawn up by Parthenius in 1643."

First, I observe, Sir, on the former of your proofs, that La Croze,² almost as good a judge of these matters as yourself, attributes the Slavonic version to the ninth century, that is to say,

¹ See Letter I. p. 5.

² *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 329 or 343, and Addenda, p. 13.

not quite a hundred years after Alcuin's revision. "It cannot be supposed, that the authors of this version would collate modern Mss. No! candor (I mean Mr. Travis's candor) obliges us to admit, that their researches were extended much higher, in all probability to the second or third century." But my candor is more easily satisfied. I am content to produce the authority of this version for no more than a tolerable proof what was the usual reading in the sixth (or if, when you find it turned against you, you should be zealous to depress its value) in the seventh and eighth centuries.

Next, I observe, that your presumptive proof may easily be gained to the other side. The Russians translated the Scriptures from Greek Mss. in the ninth century. But all the Greek Mss. of all ages omit 1 John v. 7. Therefore the Slavonic version omits it. You cannot controvert this conclusion, unless you can prove either that all the present Greek Mss. or all at least that are of the ninth century and older, retain this verse, or that it is frequently quoted by Greek authors of that and the preceding ages. For, till you can prove a universal or very general consent of the Greek Mss., how do you know but the translators lighted on some of the defective and erroneous copies, such as the Syriac and Coptic interpreters had?

Thirdly, I observe, that you are so candid as to add a note which totally overthrows what your positive proof advances. "The Slavonian Bible of 1663 has this text printed in its margin only. All the Russian Bibles have it in the body of the page." Now, Sir, since the modern Russian Bibles have no authority whatsoever, but what they derive from the ancient Slavonic, even from your own state of the case it plainly appears that this verse is an interpolation. If the curators of the edition of 1663 had a single Ms. containing the verse, at a time when their patriarch had admitted it into their confessions of faith, it is impossible that they should set so disgraceful a mark on it, as to exclude it from the text and degrade it to the margin. In this manner words and sentences utterly unknown to the author first gain admittance into the margin, and then become part of the text. Since we see this happen so often in printed books, we need not wonder at it in Mss. Whoever remembers what I have said concerning the Syriac version, will want no farther inducement to believe that the disputed verse was never in the Slavonic. But when once such passages are in possession, it is blasphemy to inquire how they came thither; it is want of candor and charity to hint a suspicion that any editor could be so "unworthy a betrayer of his trust, so unfaithful a steward of the oracles of God," &c. &c. (I omit several thousand epithets for the sake of brevity) as to increase his edition with a verse which was not extant in his Mss. But how is this verse printed in the edition of 1663? You, Sir, who at other times are luxuriant enough in your quotations, here grudge

us a short sentence. The Slavonic edition then thus represents 1 John v. 8. in the text: *And there are three witnessing on earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three agree in one.* In the margin the seventh verse: * *For there are three, &c.* Here, says Martin, the abrupt transition to *And* instead of *For* shows that it was a mere variation in the Slavonic Mss. You, Sir, may strengthen this reasoning, if you like, by observing that the words *on earth* refer to their opposites *in heaven*, and cry loudly for the insertion of the seventh verse. Besides, continues Martin, this edition professes in the preface closely to follow an elder edition printed at Ostrow in 1581. That edition, therefore, represents the passage in the same manner, being printed, no doubt, from a Ms. that had the heavenly witnesses in the margin, either from the same or from a different hand. Martin and you, Sir, I knew long since, look on the margin and text as one and the same thing. But I hope that others, whose ideas are a little more distinct, will see, that, even allowing Martin's account to be true, the verse may justly be suspected of interpolation. For myself, I own, I am not so quick of belief. Having had a little experience of pious fraud, I am apt to exclaim on such occasions; *Κάκιστ' ἀποδόλμην, εἰ τι τούτων πείθομαι.* Perhaps the reader will hardly believe, that the Ostrow edition has only these words in the text, without any marginal note: *Quoniam tres sunt testantes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres in unum sunt.* Perhaps he will find greater difficulty in believing that Newton, whose arguments you pretend to confute in your second edition, had already declared himself an eye-witness of this reading in the Ostrow edition. And I can assure you, if you will allow such a testimony as mine, that in this declaration Newton tells no lie. Newton refers also to Camillus de Antichristo,¹ who had seen one Illyric or Russian Ms., as he calls it, six hundred years old, and possessed another of great antiquity, both which read the passage in the same concise way. Perhaps you will make an objection to this Camillus, because he was a Socinian. I shall leave him to your mercy. For no heretic's word or oath ought to be believed, who writes against this verse. But how shall we elude the evidence of a Slavonic Ms. lately collated by Professor Alter,² which is guilty of the same Laconic rudeness? Perhaps the Professor too is a concealed heretic, and has made a false report.

Let us now contemplate the honesty of the Moscow editors. They dared not all at once interpolate the text with this verse. They therefore put it into the margin, hoping that it might at last

¹ P. 156. His real name was Thomas Pisecius. See Sandius Biblioth. Antitritit. p. 107.

² Var. Lect. in N. T. ex Mss. Vindobon. tom. ii. p. 1036.

arrive at the honor of being received for undoubted scripture. To accomplish this godly purpose, they first altered *For* to *And*, v. 8. then added *on earth*, and both contrary to the authority which they professed to follow, in order to persuade the ignorant and credulous that it was a mere casual omission of the transcriber. Surely never was so much fraud and forgery employed as in support of this marvellous passage!

I may now, I think, venture to affirm, that the ancient Armenian, and Slavonic versions both were ignorant of the heavenly witnesses: but I shall affirm without scruple, that you, Sir, have proved nothing to the contrary; and that, every step you take, your ignorance of the question, joined to an implicit faith in your blind guide Martin, plunges you into fresh difficulty and mistake.

POSTSCRIPT.

1. J. L. Frey told Wetstein in discoursing on 1 John v. 7. that it was wanting¹ in his copy of the Armenian version. This conversation passed in 1719, before the deadly quarrel broke out between Frey and Wetstein. I am not so sanguine as Mr. Travis; else I should produce this for a decisive testimony in my favor. For it is possible that Wetstein's memory might deceive him, or that in the eagerness of his zeal, partly against the verse, and partly against Frey, he might enlarge a simple conjecture into a positive assertion. The fact, however, is probable enough in itself, that Frey had seen, or that he possessed, an Armenian Ms. containing the Catholic Epistles. If such a Ms. be still preserved at Amsterdam, it would perhaps on examination turn out to be the same that Sandius saw in Uscan's possession. I throw out this only as a hint to those who may hereafter have inclination and opportunity to reconsider the question.

2. I learn from Mr. Matthæi,² that the first edition of the Slavonic version was printed at Prague in the year 1519. He does not mention its form, but observes that it is remarkably scarce, and rarely found entire. I have seen an old Slavonic edition, which I guess to be the same. It is a small thick octavo, but I have not been able to find any date of time and place. Nor is it necessary to make any particular inquiry after so perverse and disloyal a book, which scarcely furnishes half its complement of text on this dangerous and distressing occasion.

¹ Regessit neque exstare apud Patres, ne apud Cyprianum quidem, si recte inspicitur, neque in Ms. Sancto-Gallensi, aliisque veteribus codicibus Latinis, neque in Versione, quam haberet, Armena. Wetstein Prolegom. p. 192.

² Append. II. ad Apocalyps. p. 346.

OXFORD ENGLISH PRIZE ESSAY, FOR 1827.

The Influence of the Crusades on the Arts and Literature of Europe.

“To these wild expeditions, the effect of superstition and folly, we owe the first gleams of light which tended to dispel barbarism and ignorance.” --*Robertson, Charles V.*

ARGUMENT.—Introduction. Difference of opinion on the present question, to be reconciled by a distinction between the direct and the indirect influence of the Crusades on the arts and literature of Europe.

1. The direct influence of the Crusades shown to have been subordinate to that of other circumstances, and comparatively unimportant. Causes assigned for the positive and negative character of this influence.

2. The indirect influence of the Crusades shown to have been beneficial to the arts and literature of Europe. §. 1. By the excitation and concentration of feeling. §. 2. By the removal of obstacles connected with the feudal system. §. 3. By the eventual substitution of commercial for military habits. This change, in its progress, favorable to useful arts; in its effects, to elegant arts and literature.

Objections to this view of the subject, examined. Conclusion, adverting to the comparative refinement of Europe and the East at this time, as contrasted with that of each in the age of the Crusades.

THE intellectual character of nations has often derived advantage from times of political convulsion or military excitement. The powers, which have been stimulated by one motive, are easily sustained by another; and the first impulse, therefore, as it is not generally the best, should be such as effectually to awaken, but not permanently to engross, the mind. The enthusiasm of war, and the agitations of party spirit, are precisely of this animating, but transient nature; while the attractions of knowledge, more durable, though less dazzling, than the triumphs of military or political pre-eminence, are those most likely to give the ultimate direction to feelings and energies, which they were not originally strong enough to inspire. In Greece, the habits of mental exertion, which led to intellectual, no less than to political, dominion, were formed by the emergencies of a foreign invasion; the genius of the Augustan age was matured in the civil wars which preceded it; and the restoration of arts and literature to Europe was accelerated by an event, which, in the keenness and universality of the interest promoted by it, has no parallel in the history of former times. The attempt of the Christians in Western Europe to recover the Holy Land was the first great subject, after the fall of

the Roman empire, which inflamed the passions, and transformed the characters of men, too powerfully to admit of a relapse into apathy and its attendant ignorance.

In assuming that the influence of the Crusades on the arts and literature of Europe was at once extensive and beneficial, reference has been made to remote and accidental, rather than to immediate consequences. Effects, the slowest in progress, are often the surest in operation; especially when differing wholly in character from the cause with which they are connected. The Crusades, from their nature, could only have occasioned a revolution in the intellectual state of Europe by introducing a preparatory change of feelings and habits. Their influence, therefore, on arts and literature, so far as it was complete and universal, must necessarily have been mediate and progressive.

With this distinction in view, it will not be difficult to reconcile, in some measure, the apparently opposite conclusions, at which writers on the present subject have arrived. Errors of opinion have here, as elsewhere, been mutually repelled into extremes. The influence of the Crusades has been greatly exaggerated by some, and altogether denied by others. The generality have been more prone to remark the political and social, than the intellectual results of the Crusades. But in ascertaining the existence of the one, they have implied that of the other. No great change in the condition of man, as a member of society or of a political community, has ever taken place without a corresponding effect on the character of his intellectual operations.

Here, then, in a mean between two extremes of opinion, the truth will probably be found. Europe was neither wholly active, nor wholly passive, in the change from barbarism to refinement. She acted at once spontaneously, and under the effect of impressions produced by external circumstances. Among these, however, it is impossible not to assign the foremost rank to that remarkable project, which has conferred a name, as it stamped a character, on its age. But the intimations of history confirm the suggestions of antecedent probability in warranting the assertion, that the Crusades were not so directly a cause of actual knowledge, introduced by their direct influence into Europe, as of those awakened feelings and altered habits, by which the useful arts in the first instance, and eventually the elegant arts and literature, were indisputably promoted. "The natural genius and intellectual habits of men," it has been of old remarked, "are more easily repressed than recalled;"¹ and it was no single event, however interesting, nor age, however fertile of impressions, that could effectually have restored the mental powers of Europe after five

¹ "Ingenia studiaque hominum oppresseris facilius quam revocaveris."—*Tac.*

centuries of ignorance and prejudice. Accordingly we find between the Crusades and the revival of learning an interval of two centuries; and that too, a period so generally devoid of intellectual cultivation, and so fertile in concurrent causes of knowledge, as to withhold from the Crusades all primary and exclusive claims to the merit of restoring European arts and literature. To fix then the permanent advantages of those expeditions on their remote, indirect, and accidental influence, as well as to ascertain the nature and extent of their immediate effects, will be the object of the present discussion.

The immediate benefits of the Crusades we naturally look for in the arts and literature of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. But this period we find to differ in no important point from the preceding. Original literature is still, throughout the whole of this long interval, confined principally to works of imagination, and knowledge of classical antiquity to a minute, but trivial, acquaintance with the Aristotelian philosophy; medicine, geometry, and arithmetic,¹ are in these, as in former centuries, the studies pursued in the schools of Cordova and Salerno; to the general absence of useful arts some exceptions begin at length to appear in the manufacture of silk, and the construction of wind-mills;² while, of elegant arts, architecture alone continues to be cultivated with success.

To what, then, we proceed to inquire, are we to ascribe this elementary and superficial knowledge? Not certainly in any great degree to the Crusades; for it is found to have existed in the preceding century. To the reign of Charlemagne, probably, and the dispersion of the Normans, we are to look for some of the earliest causes of reviving intellect. But for the traces of Oriental knowledge, (with which we are now more immediately concerned,) we must refer to the Saracenic conquests in Spain, and the intercourse subsequently maintained by the travels of Gerbert more especially, between that country and the rest of Europe. Nor must we omit, as a powerful cause of the same taste for Oriental literature, the visits, devotional or commercial, of individuals to Palestine. This knowledge continued from the ninth to the fifteenth century to flow into Europe; and it is often difficult or impossible to ascertain exactly the proportion due to each separate cause of connexion with the East. The light of learning and civilisation was so gradually and imperceptibly diffused, that we often fail in attempting to separate its collected rays, and to assign a determinate color and force to each.

But the arts and literature of Europe, in the age of the Crusades and that which immediately followed, although in kind scarcely

¹ Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. cent. ix. x. and xi

² Gibbon, vol. xi. c. 61, note.

distinguishable from those in the preceding century, were widely different in degree. Poetry and fiction were already more interesting in materials, and more systematic in form; the Aristotelian philosophy lent its aid more generally to the spirit of scholastic disputation; and considerable accessions had been made to the mathematical, arithmetical, and medicinal knowledge of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

In Architecture, changes had been introduced from the East which to some have appeared fundamental. But the progress which from specimens in our own country, we know that this art had previously made, forbids¹ us to regard the improvements derived from Palestine as sufficiently novel in character to justify an exception to a rule elsewhere so generally applicable.

Thus then we gather, that the effects produced immediately by the Crusades on the Arts and Literature of Europe were chiefly of a subordinate and supplemental character. They tended to strengthen and extend pre-existing impressions; to confirm, rather than to originate knowledge. For any considerable diffusion of arts and literature, unknown before the Crusades, we look in vain till the fifteenth century. The enlargement of geographical knowledge, on which some have insisted, seems too little a consequence of the Crusades, as distinguished from any other distant expedition, to demand attention; and, in fact, as the means of future acquisitions in arts and literature, rather than the exemplification of a direct intellectual influence, may be referred, like the corresponding effect of the Crusades on Commerce, to the second division of our subject.—Nor does it seem necessary, in a comprehensive view of the question like the present, to dwell on certain comparatively unimportant arts,² brought to perfection soon after the Crusades, which have been by some thought sufficient to give a primary character to the influence of those expeditions. We must here and elsewhere distinguish as well between effects and mere coincidences, as between knowledge directly introduced from the East by the Crusades, and that which was attendant on a reviving spirit of industry in Europe, whether due to the Crusades or to other causes.

Two inquiries here naturally suggest themselves: why and in what manner were the Crusades productive of any immediate influence on the arts and literature of Europe? and why were they not productive of more?

That the Crusades should have exercised some direct influence

¹ Quart. Review, Aug. 1809.

² The use of the sugar-cane, and the knowledge and application of particular drugs. Likewise the manufacture of silk; but there is no certainty, nor sometimes even probability, that any of these improvements were introduced by the Crusades. See Robertson, Charles V. note 30.

on the arts and literature of Europe, we might reasonably have expected from the character, the duration, and the locality of the holy wars. However generally unconnected with the motives and designs, whether of the assailants or of the assailed, the communication or the admission of knowledge may hereafter be proved to have been, some traces of national refinement, whether in Asia or at Constantinople, could scarcely fail, during a protracted intercourse with the West, to have been displayed and imparted. To the knowledge of the Aristotelian philosophy in Europe, the Crusaders were involuntary contributors, by introducing one additional treatise¹ of the Stagirite. Again, in Architecture and Poetry, we shall easily reconcile with our preconceived notions the appearance of a still more decided effect. The religious nature of the enterprise will account for its influence on the first; its imaginative and enthusiastic character for a peculiar adaptation to the second. Every part, indeed, of the Crusader's project was poetical; its plan, its accompaniments, its object. The poet and the romance writer exult in the sacrifice of self-interest to hazard and imagination; of the dull and monotonous realities of common life to the bright visions of the hero and the enthusiast. By intercourse, too, with the proper land of fiction, the ideal world of poetry was peopled with new beings, and embellished by new combinations of images. Nor is fact wanting to justify our argument. We know from history that Minstrels formed an important part of the Crusade retinue; and thus was accomplished a more than imaginary union between the exploits of the warrior and the conceptions of the poet. Hence, to the latest posterity, the recollection of the Crusades always summoned up a train of associations highly favorable to poetic incident. Yet, even in this point, (the only one in which the character of the Crusades was obviously connected with literature,) we have no reason to believe that they exercised immediately more than an auxiliary influence.

Closely interwoven with the history of the Crusades, and such, indeed, as in estimating their effects on arts and literature, we must consider an integral part of the holy wars, was the temporary reign of the Latins at Constantinople. From the comparatively peaceful nature of this connexion; from the greater facilities which it afforded, by proximity of situation, to the intercourse of the East and West; from the more intimate (however incomplete) resemblance of languages and national habits, we might reasonably have expected that this partial union of Eastern with Western *Europeans* would have occasioned a greater and more extensive benefit to the unenlightened nations of the West, than the tumultuous sojourn in the Holy Land. But any such pleasing anticipations are disappointed by the event. The reign of the Latin

¹The Metaphysics. Mills, History of the Crusades.

emperors at Constantinople was unaccompanied in its immediate effects by any direct or permanent introduction¹ of Grecian language or literature into Western Europe. Accidentally, indeed, the occupation of the Eastern empire was productive of some advantage to the literature of the West. The persecuted scholar, whose home was now that of his enemies, occasionally sought refuge² among the people of Western Europe, and imparted, in return for their hospitality, a portion of his knowledge. But it was long before the seed, thus thinly scattered, took deep root in the barren and unyielding soil of the West.

The positive effects directly produced by the Crusades on the Arts and Literature of Europe have thus been summarily stated. The limited extent of those effects, or, in other words, the absence of any original, universal, and decisive influence, next presents itself. And for this also sufficient cause may be found in the nature and object of the Crusades; in the characters of those who engaged in them; and in the intellectual condition of the country wherein they were conducted. The investigation of these topics will leave it more a matter of surprise that the Crusades had any immediate effect on Arts and Literature, than that they had so little.

The state of excitement which an expedition, strictly military, produces throughout the whole community of persons interested in its success, (and, in the instance of the Crusades, that community was all Europe,) is little calculated to favor the cultivation of the intellectual powers. However these excited feelings may eventually be directed with advantage to the labors of useful, or the refinements of polished life, they are adverse, while military renown alone is the object in view, to all steady and systematic exertion in any other department. The arts belong proverbially to the leisure of peace; and literature, among nations as well as individuals, is then only promoted with complete success, when cultivated as a primary object of employment, rather than as a recreation from the toils of the city or the camp.

This remark is still more applicable to the case of those who were actually engaged in the expedition. To excel in arms, not in arts, was their object; and if they gazed for a while³ with stupid amazement on the classic treasures of Constantinople, it was only to calculate the vastness of their booty, and to collect fury for the attack. The Crusaders, moreover, visited the East under the strongest of prejudices—those of religious hatred; and hence to them, as to the Greek of old, difference of climate and opinion alone seemed to constitute barbarism. Lastly, the igno-

¹ Gibbon, vol. xi. c. 61.

² Berington, *Literary History of the Middle Ages*.

³ Robertson, Charles V. *Introductory chapter*. Note.

rance, general or universal, among the Crusaders, of all languages but their own, would act as an additional barrier to that communication with their more polished enemies, from which their minds alone were sufficiently averse. These obstacles would operate in regard to the connexion both with Constantinople and with Syria, and the consideration of them leads us to presume, that any knowledge derived from the East by means of the Crusades must have been derived partially and accidentally.

But with reference to Arabian knowledge, another circumstance opposes itself to the presumption of any direct results from the Crusades. The Augustan age of Haroun and Almaimoun, it must be recollected, was no more; for Arabian literature, like a forced plant, had been transient in its bloom, because unnatural in its maturity. Some traces, indeed, of former cultivation might still be found within the walls of Bagdad, and thence the Crusaders derived a small and occasional advantage. But that fire of inventive genius, and spirit of literary research, which once characterised the Arabians, and which alone could have been expected permanently to benefit the minds of the Europeans, had already subsided.

Nor, perhaps, has Europe any just ground for lamenting that her subsequent progress in knowledge was rather the result of her own exertions, (however aided by external circumstances,) than of any immediate connexion with the East; and that the energies aroused by the Crusades were not wasted in the exclusive cultivation of Arabian literature. For it was, after all, by ingenuity and quickness of invention, (so peculiarly national, as to be scarcely, under any circumstances, communicable to minds of a colder temperament,) rather than by any substantial acquirements of knowledge, that the Arabians, at this period, were distinguished. The arts and sciences, in which they had made proficiency, were generally ineffective from their neutral character; at once too practical to be elegant, and too fanciful to be useful. The study of Medicine and the art of Calculation were marred by the follies of the talisman and the horoscope. Their philosophy too was of the same description. It was the system of Aristotle, ingrafted on brilliant speculations, and perverted by national ingenuity. Like the rest of Arabian knowledge, therefore, it combined much that was useful with more that was dangerous; and to inexperienced minds the dangerous part was that which more easily assimilated itself. Hence the leading defect of all the literature which, before and during the Crusades, Europe derived from the East. Imagination encroached on every department, and tyrannised in its own. Philosophy was fanciful, and Fiction extravagant. Nor did the researches of Science share a better fate. Astronomy was lost in astrology, Chemistry in alchemy, and Medicine in empiricism. Yet such had been the darkness of a former period, that we hail the

appearance even of these errors as an indication of returning energy, and an earnest of future aspirations.

2. If, then, the Crusades did not immediately contribute to any important change in arts and literature, it remains to be shown, in the second place, that they were beneficial to the intellectual powers, by awakening the feelings, and changing the views of the Europeans.

To inspire Europe with an ardor of pursuit hitherto unknown ; to render her the instrument of her own intellectual resuscitation, rather than the recipient of extraneous knowledge ; to break through her habitual associations in matters of knowledge and taste, effecting an oblivion of all that was erroneous in the arts and literature already prevalent, and applying the better part of them to advantage : this was necessary in order to insure that high pre-eminence of literary and civilised character, which the Europeans have now generally obtained ; and to this the indirect influence of the Crusades will appear to have been conducive.

Previously, however, to an examination of the means by which the Crusades were instrumental to this end, it will be necessary to remove the apparent objection, founded on the interval of two centuries between the Crusades and the revival of learning ; an objection, which, although valid as regards the effects of the expedition on the actual knowledge of the Europeans, is inapplicable to the supposition of a remote prospective influence on Arts and Literature, produced by a change of moral feeling and political character.

That enthusiasm and that susceptibility of impression, which were at once the cause and the consequence of the expeditions to Palestine, and which, therefore, have rightly been termed the "spirit of the Crusades," long survived the failure of the actual project. If the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were the age of the Crusades, the two following were not less the age of associations connected with the wars in Palestine. It was no false estimate of popular feeling which suggested, during the fourteenth, and the earlier part of the fifteenth century, the reiteration of the summons to Palestine ; and the disappointments consequent on experience alone, counteracted the influence of enthusiasm yet predominant. Nor will it appear surprising that this enthusiasm continued to prevail, when we recollect the various circumstances of adventitious interest by which it was fostered. To the impressions of a former period, currency and value had been given by the creation of the Crusade orders of knighthood ; by the animating effusions of lyric poetry ; by the accurate details of history ; and the striking embellishments of fiction. And thus the Crusades continued in the minds of men as the watchword of Chivalry and the theme of Romance, till Tasso gave perpetuity by his immortal poem to the records of an event, which had not, even in his age,

ceased to be of public interest. The fourteenth century, so far from being justly considered as a vacuum between the Crusades and the revival of literature, was in spirit an active, though in knowledge an unproductive, period; furnished with many links in the chain by which cause and effect are strongly, however remotely, connected. At least imagination, that power which, among nations in a dark age, as in the mind of individuals when asleep, becomes the substitute for deeper intellectual faculties, continued to exercise a decided influence from the period of the Crusades to that of restored learning; and was as certainly an accompaniment and a consequence of the one, as it was a cause of the other.

§. 1. The Crusades appear to have been permanently advantageous to Europe by directing to one object of unanimous and lasting interest, the feelings and prejudices of men. Like rays of light, the energies of the human mind are comparatively powerless, unless concentrated. Dispersion in the one case, and distraction in the other, are fatal to effective application. The perpetual recurrence, therefore, of enthusiasm and imagination (which during the middle ages were exposed to the frequent influence of trivial objects) to one subject of universal interest, gave a vigor to individual minds, and an efficacy to collective exertion, which became the precedent and the principle of a more enlarged system of intellectual activity. So far, then, as the great Expedition of the Middle Ages was single in interest, it was beneficial to the intellectual powers of men; so far as that single object was of a military character, it was injurious to them. The effects of this concentration of interest remained, and were applied to better purposes, after the immediate cause of the interest had passed away. And thus the Crusades were, from this compound character, at once immediately prejudicial, and ultimately favorable to knowledge; prejudicial, that is, to the continued cultivation of such arts and branches of literature as prevailed in the dark ages; and favorable to the introduction of those which were to grace a brighter period.

We must be careful, however, to distinguish between identity of object and unanimity of plan. Some have attributed beneficial consequences to the actual union of nations, and, as it is called, collision of minds, in the Crusades. But of these results, the former was of short continuance, and the latter of questionable utility. The Crusades, although an ideal bond of union, were an actual cause of dissension. The collision of minds, too, is then only favorable to the developement of faculties in each individual, when those minds have previously been cultivated, and are bent on distinct, yet kindred, intellectual pursuits.

§. 2. The effects of the Crusades on politics and society have generally been admitted. They contributed, undesignedly indeed, but forcibly, to the stability of governments; to the organization

of communities; to definition of rights, and enlargement of civil liberty. It is almost unnecessary to point out the influence of each political and social change here described on the intellectual character. Where confusion and distraction prevailed before, we have now regularity and steadiness; where mental vigor was formerly harassed in asserting undefined rights, or in extricating itself from unnecessary restraints, it is now free to dwell on the records of ancient lore, or to expatiate in the unexplored region of discovery. Vain indeed, or worse than vain, without this salutary preparation, would have been the influx of literature into Europe on the fall of Constantinople! But it was wisely provided that the Crusades should not be the occasion of knowledge which would have been useless, because premature; but of changes which indirectly facilitated the admission and the application of that knowledge, when it was eventually, and by the agency of other causes, introduced.

It has been observed, that the immediate and the remote consequences of the Crusades were often widely different. This is peculiarly true of their effects on the military habits of Europe. We have seen them for a time giving new ardor and activity to the warlike character; engrossing the popular mind with an exclusive passion for deeds of arms; sacrificing intellectual cultivation to corporeal prowess; converting the land of the Cross into the field of Chivalry, and again promoting Chivalry in Europe by connecting it, in the person of the Crusade knight, with the inspiring recollections of holy ground.

We now view the same Crusades in their remote effects, as the accidental means of exhausting the military spirit of Europe. To those who had fought in Palestine with all the animating associations of place and circumstance; defending the religion of their Redeemer on the spot of his death; the petty distinctions of military tenure seemed a very inadequate subject of contention. But there was a still more obvious reason for the decline of the feudal system. The expenses incurred in the holy wars occasioned, on the return of the Crusaders, the sale² of many baronial estates. And thus were gradually abolished those feudal institutions, "which had been so intrinsically adverse to all arts by which the evils of man are mitigated, or his labors abridged."³ Hence too followed the distinction of professions, before so unjustly distri-

¹ The heaviest anathemas were denounced against those who should disquiet or annoy such as had devoted themselves to the Crusade service. Private quarrels and hostilities were accordingly banished. *Robertson, Charles V.*

² *Robertson, &c. Gibbon, vol. xi.* Among the causes which undermined the Gothic edifice of feudalism, a conspicuous place must be allowed to the Crusades.

³ *Hallam, Middle Ages.*

buted, or so preposterously confused ;¹ and the consequent advantage to intellectual cultivation corresponding with that which manual operations derive from a division of labor.

§. 3. If, then, the Crusades had been thus instrumental only in removing a positive obstacle to the cultivation of knowledge, the beneficial tendency of their influence would have been sufficiently established. But they were more than negatively useful. In contributing to obliterate the traces of an exclusively military character, they gradually substituted habits which were as decidedly beneficial to arts and literature as those which they supplanted had been injurious.

The difference of natural productions in different climates, and the benefits of exchange, though not unknown to the Europeans before the Crusades, were rendered strikingly apparent during their long residence in the East. They acquired, moreover, a taste for distant excursions, and a knowledge of local peculiarities. Commerce too, especially maritime, was promoted by the necessity of supplies for the Crusaders, and the privileges secured by the holy wars to mercantile speculation.² When, therefore, the love of military renown declined throughout Europe, the spirit of adventure was gradually directed to the pursuit of wealth. The commercial character, which before had been subordinate to the military, was thus extended and confirmed by the Crusades, till at length it became the distinguishing feature of Europe.

The facilities and refinements of navigation, including, of course, the discovery of the compass, were among the earliest attendants of improving commerce ; and, as the means of still further acquisitions, may be regarded as the most important. Then follow all those arts of utility and convenience by which the productions of nature are applied or improved. The arts of weaving and dying, the manufacture of paper, and the application of printing have been attributed, each in its turn, to the Crusades, but were in fact only the indirect results of those expeditions through the medium of increasing Industry and Commerce. If, however, to the discoveries already enumerated we add the composition of gunpowder, each higher department of active life, the commercial, the literary, and the military, will appear furnished, soon after the Crusades, with its own peculiar instrumental art.

Again, the results of Commerce, wealth, and luxury, were equally favorable to the cultivation of elegant knowledge. We need not refer to the comparative refinement of Athens and Lacedæmon in order to prove the benefits which intellectual cultivation derives from wealth. Modern Italy suggests a more appropriate example. That country was at once the most commercial in Europe, and

¹ As in the "*Miles Clericus*."

² Robertson, *America*, *India*, *Charles V*

the earliest to awaken the genius of Painting and Sculpture, of Poetry and elegant Literature. It was the first to display the beneficial effects of the Crusades, because it had the greatest predisposition to favor that peculiar character of which the Crusades were productive. Even before the eleventh century, had Commerce, despised in more chivalrous regions as the dull and unpoeitical pursuit of ordinary minds, found a home on the shores of Italy, and introduced comparative refinement at Genoa, Venice, and Amalfi.

Since Italy was the country whence the knowledge of modern Europe, especially that of an elegant character, originated, it is important to ascertain that the commercial effects of the Crusades were there principally discernible. But the whole of Europe speedily experienced the same beneficial results. We hear soon after the Crusades, of more magnificence in the structure of palaces, and a more refined taste in their decorations. Luxury and the arts now fostered each other. By the decline, too, of the feudal system, the benefits of monarchical patronage were secured to the efforts of genius and the cultivation of taste.

The progress of literature was widely different from that of the arts. Here the imagination was exercised, before the understanding was matured. Modern Poetry, which began with Dante, was long antecedent to modern Philosophy; so long, indeed, that it may seem almost fanciful to refer the great improvement of the reasoning powers in the sixteenth century to the influence of the Crusades in the thirteenth. But the springs even of this intellectual action, however tardy or complicated in their operation, may be traced to that expedition which first called forth the energies of Europe, and promoted a spirit of unprejudiced inquiry.

To sum up the argument. The Crusades have seemed destitute neither of direct, nor of indirect, influence on the Arts and Literature of Europe. Their immediate influence, however, has appeared on investigation to have been in character subordinate, and in extent limited; but their remote and indirect results, to have been primarily and permanently beneficial to Europe. On the whole it may be concluded, that, while the Crusades were, according to human calculation, ill adapted to produce any intellectual results, they were rendered accidentally, or, as we may rather say, providentially, an unforeseen, but to future ages easily discernible cause of acceleration to the age of restored learning and original invention.

It remains to consider the arguments adduced to prove that the Crusades, so far from having exercised a favorable influence on the intellectual state of Europe, were instrumental in retarding the progress of learning and refinement. Of these objections to the view at present taken of the question, some have been already considered, and most will be met by the general plan which has been adopted, of regarding the Crusades as the remote and not

106 *Oxford English Prize Essay, for 1827.*

the immediate cause of a beneficial influence. But two questions of some interest remain to be examined.

The destruction of so many valuable monuments of ancient learning and taste at Constantinople, although not strictly a consequence of the Crusades, it may fairly be said would not have taken place but for those expeditions. Writers have, therefore, deviated from the subject of the Crusades, to comment with unmeasured abhorrence on the savage fury of those barbarians who viewed with complacency the demolition they had caused. But it has been well remarked, that the knowledge of modern Europe, had it been less her own, would have been less permanent and effectual. Enough of classic art and literature still remained to facilitate and direct the exertions of Europe without depriving them of the merit and the advantages of originality. The chaos of the dark ages was the best foundation of the newly-created intellectual universe; but the materials of a former world might aptly be introduced to complete and beautify the fabric which they could not have supported. The Crusaders, then, might unconsciously have done service to future arts and literature, by destroying those superabundant models, which would have cramped the genius, before they could have refined the taste, of European imitators.

The tendency of the Crusades to increase the power of the Church is a still more specious objection. It cannot be denied that the treasury of the Church was enriched, and its influence extended, by the holy wars; and it is equally unquestionable that this newly-acquired wealth and influence were employed forthwith to check the progress of inquiry, and to extend the empire of superstition. The Cross, which had hitherto been raised as the ensign of intolerance against infidelity alone, was now assumed to extirpate heresy; and whatever of Scriptural doctrine or Apostolic discipline had under that name been preserved free from contagion in the Valdensian or Albigensian churches, was opposed with a violence which the yet prevailing spirit of the Crusades alone could have projected or carried into execution.

But here, as elsewhere, we must recur to the distinction so often made between the immediate and the remote consequences of the Crusades. The ecclesiastical power eventually sank under its own weight; and the Crusades were among those causes which contributed to weaken the foundations of the structure, by adding to its encumbrances. Moreover, they rendered palpable and intolerable those particular errors, by the exposure of which the Reformation was effected. The sale of indulgences was brought to its height by the Crusades; and *this* was the very corruption which provoked the indignation of Luther. Thus then to the Crusades we may not unfairly ascribe the acceleration of that great event, which was at once the most important consequence of restored learning, and the surest guarantee for its continuance.

Whatever cause, therefore, we may find, in the origin and progress of the Crusades, to reprobate the operation of unwarrantable motives, or to deplore the effects of misguided zeal, we can scarcely fail to acknowledge, in the final disposition of events, the subservience of human weakness to the ends of Divine Wisdom and Goodness. Amid scenes of plunder and bloodshed, in the country of infidels or enemies, were sown, unconsciously, the seeds of intellectual greatness, which were ultimately to ripen into an abundant harvest. The fruit, now matured, may return to its parent earth with additional promise.—In the progress of ages, Europe has obtained that ascendancy in knowledge and refinement, whereby she may be enabled to dispel from the face of other nations the darkness in which she was herself formerly enveloped. To that Eastern hemisphere, especially, whence she first derived the light of learning and civilisation, and whence, at a later period, she drew the materials of a character which prepared her for still greater accessions of knowledge;—thither, from the fulness of her own intellectual meridian, she may now return, and kindle a brighter light than she received!

The champions of her Religion may now too, as of old, unfurl the banner of the Cross; which, however, to those, who from distant lands descry its approach, shall no longer seem the standard of war and desolation, but the harbinger of glad tidings, and the symbol of universal peace.

FREDERICK OAKELEY,
FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE.

NUGÆ.

No. XXII.—[Continued from No. I. XXIV.]

I. ARISTOT. Poet. xlv. Buhle. (xlv. Tyrwhitt.) τὰ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ὁρῶντα (ἀμαρτήματα) δεῖ διαλύειν—διαίρεσει· οἷον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς· Αἴψα δὲ θνήτ' ἐφύοντο, τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι, Ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν κέρριτο. “Codd. collati omnes, Ζῶά τε πρὶν κέρριτο (Codd. Ven. Paris. 1741. κέρρητο).—Victorius primus in textu exhibuit Ζωρά τε· retinuit tamen πρὶν κέρριτο. Veriorem lectionem restituit—Madius ex Athen. Dipnos. x. p. 423 f. et Simplic. ad Arist. Ausc. Phys. fol. 7. b. apud quos fragmentum Physicorum Empedoclis, ex quo versus illi desumpti sunt, auctius legitur sic :

Αἴψα δὲ θνήτ' ἐφύοντο, τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι,
ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα, διαλλάξαντα κελεύθους.

Madium secuti sunt Heinsius et Reizius, qui habent ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα. — Pro κέκριτο dedit Batteusius κέκρατο· et sic legendum esse censet quoque Tyrwhittus, quoniam ζωρά et ἄκρητα nullam inter se conversionem pati possunt, cum prorsus eadem sint. Enimvero lis fuit inter veteres ipsos, quoniam significato vox ζωρά sit accipienda. Theophrastus ἐν τῷ περὶ μέθης secundum Athenæum l. l. τὸ ζωρὸν non ἄκρατον sed κεκραμένον, non *purum*, sed *mixtum*, significare voluit; cui tamen interpretationi vix alii adstipulati sunt, cum alias τὸ ζωρὸν semper in Græco sermone, etiam apud Homerum, *purum* denotaverit. Sic utique melior lectio esset ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν κέκρατο, quam equidem in textum recepi.” Buhle in loc. Sturz, in his Commentatio de Empedoclis Vita et Philosophia, p. 578. reads ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα, and quotes Theophrastus, Plutarch, and Eustathius, to prove that ζωρά is synonymous with κεκραμένα.

Of the above three readings, Buhle's is destructive of the metre: Tyrwhitt's, ζωρά τε πρὶν κέκρατο, (or rather κέκρητο, on account of the dialect, and because the transformation of κέκρητο into κέκριτο is more easily explicable, on the ground of *iotacism*, than that of κέκρατο into κέκριτο,) seems to us objectionable, inasmuch as it does not involve in it any ambiguity of the kind specified by Aristotle; at least, we do not think that any Greek of Aristotle's time could have hesitated as to the meaning of the words. With regard to the third reading, ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα, it seems to be questionable whether Empedocles would have shortened the α before κρ; though on this point we speak with hesitation. Quere, ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν κρητά? By thus correcting, we shall not only obviate the difficulties above mentioned, but likewise satisfy the scruples of those who think that there is no sufficient reason for attributing two contradictory meanings to ζωρός. We subjoin the entire fragment, partly from Sturz's emendation. It reminds us (as do some other parts of these fragments) of Milton's Chaos and his Creation.

— ἐπεὶ Νεῖκος μὲν ἐνέρτατον ἦκετο βένθος
 δίνης, ἐν δὲ μέσῃ Φιλότης στροφάλιγγι γένηται,
 ἐν τῇ δὴ τάδε πάντα συνέρχεται ἐν μόνον εἶναι,
 οὐκ ἄφαρ, ἀλλὰ θέλυμνα συνίσταται ἄλλοθεν ἄλλο.
 πολλά δ' ἄμικτ' ἔστηκε κερασσαμένοισιν ἐναλλάξ,
 ὅσσοι ἔτι Νεῖκος ἔρυκε μετάρσιον· οὐ γὰρ ἀμέμφεως
 πῶ πᾶν ἐξέστηκεν ἐπ' ἔσχατα τέρματα κύκλου,
 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τ' ἐνέμιμνε μέρεων, τὰ δὲ τ' ἐξεβεβήκει.
 ὅσσον δ' αἶεν ὑπεκπροθεῖ, τόσον αἶεν ἐπῆει
 ἢ πύφρων Φιλότητος ἀμεμφέος ἀμβροτος ὁρμή.
 αἰψά δὲ θνήτ' ἐφύοντο, τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι,

ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα, διαλλάξαντα κελευθούς.
τῶν δέ τε μισγομένων, χεῖτ' ἔθνεα μυρία θνητῶν,
παντοίης ἰδέησιν ἀρρήττα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι.

II. Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ii. 223.

— since our present lot appears

For happy though but ill, for ill not worst.

Compare *Theognis*, v. 509. Gaisford. ἦν δέ τις εἰρωτᾷ τὸν ἑμὸν βίον, ὧδέ οἱ εἰπείν' Ὡς εὖ μὲν, χαλεπῶς ὡς χαλεπῶς δέ, μάλ' εὖ.

III. Plat. *Lys.* xcv. δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὃ γε πονηρὸς τῷ πονηρῷ, ὅσῳ ἂν ἐγγυτέρω προσῇ καὶ μᾶλλον ὀμιλῇ, τοσούτῳ ἐχθρίων γίνεσθαι—. Socrates had just before been quoting Homer: are these words a tacit citation from some other old poet — ὅσῳ ἂν ἐγγυτέρω προσῇ, καὶ μᾶλλον ὀμιλῇ?

IV. Thucyd. ii. 65. ὅς (ὁ ἐς Σικελίαν πλοῦς) οὐ τοσούτον γνώμης ἀμάρτημα ἦν, πρὸς οὓς ἐπῆσαν, ὅσον οἱ ἐκπέμφαντες οὐ τὰ πρόσφορα τοῖς οἰχομένοις ἐπιγιγνώσκοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας διαβολὰς περὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου προστασίας τὰ τε ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἀμβλύτερα ἐποιοῦν, καὶ &c. "Quæ suscepta est non tam peccato judicii, et culpa corum, ad quos Athenienses proficiscebantur, quam illorum, qui classem illam emiscent, qui non cognoscebant ea, quæ suis illuc profectis conducebant: sed propter privatas similitudinis de populi principatu contendentes, et res, quæ militiæ gerebantur, debilitarunt, et &c." *Latin Translation.* We quote this translation, because one of the errors contained in it seems to be acquiesced in by the commentators, we mean the false rendering of ἐπιγιγνώσκοντες, by which in the first place the two senses of γινώσκειν are confounded together, and, secondly, ἐπιγιγνώσκειν is translated as if it were synonymous with γινώσκειν. Γινώσκειν is here *to decree or determine*; ἐπὶ has the force of *subsequently and in pursuance of*; — addition to what they had already done, and by way of following it up. Οὐ τὰ πρόσφορα τοῖς οἰχομένοις ἐπιγιγνώσκοντες is therefore "neglecting to follow up their expedition by subsequent resolutions calculated to promote its success."

V. Id. *ibid.* 87, init. Οὐχὶ ἐς ναυμαχίαν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπὶ στρατείαν ἐπλέομεν, compared with 83, where the same thing is spoken of: ἐπλεον — οὐκ ἐπὶ ναυμαχίαν, ἀλλὰ στρατιωτικώτερον παρσκευασμένοι· another instance of the use of οὐ with a comparative, illustrated *Nugæ*, No. xviii. (*Class. Journ.* lxx.) Compare v. 8. vii. 63. καὶ ταῦτα τοῖς ἐπλίταις οὐχ ἥσσον τῶν ναυτῶν παρακλειεύομαι, ὅσῳ τῶν ἀνῶθεν μᾶλλον τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο. viii. 27.

ἔδοξεν οὐκ ἐν τῷ αὐτίκα μᾶλλον ἢ ὕστερον—οὐκ ἀξύνετος εἶναι, compared with the context. 36. ἐδόκουν τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις αἱ πρῶται ξυνθῆμαι—ἐνδεεῖς εἶναι, καὶ οὐ πρὸς σφῶν μᾶλλον.

VI. Id. iv. 30, init. τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν ἀναγκασθέντων διὰ τὴν στενοχωρίαν τῆς νήσου, τοῖς ἐσχάτοις προσίσχοντας ἀριστοποιεῖσθαι. Haack has rescued this passage from the double fault of tautology and defectiveness, by restoring the true punctuation : ἀναγκασθέντων διὰ τὴν στενοχωρίαν, τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τῆς νήσου προσίσχοντας ἀριστ. So 54, init. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι—τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατεύματι ἀποβάντες τῆς νήσου ἐς τὰ πρὸς Μαλέαν τετραμμένα, ἐχώρου ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπὶ θαλάσῃ πόλιν τῶν Κυθρίων.

VII. Id. vi. 6. μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς ἐξώρμησαν Ἑγεσταίων τε πρέσβεις παρόντες, καὶ προθυμότερον ἐπικαλούμενοι. "Quinam alii ergo, aut quorum? Nulli autem. Transposite intell. pro, οἱ Ἑγεστ. πρεσβ. παρόντες τε καὶ — ἐπικαλούμενοι. Verborum enim hic fit distributio, vel attributorum, non hominum." Bayer. An explanation which involves a solecism. "Non absurde particulæ τε—καὶ membrorum principiis subjiciuntur; quemadmodum Latine non vitiose dixeris: 'Maxime vero eos incitabant et Segestanorum præsentibus, et acrius adhortantes legati.'" Haack. To render the two sentences parallel, the Greek should be: μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς ἐξώρμησαν καὶ Ἑγεσταίων πρέσβεις παρόντες, καὶ πρ. ἐπ. Τε, in fact, has a reference, not to any thing in this part of the chapter, but to a sentence near its conclusion. The construction is as follows: Μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς ἐξώρμησαν Ἑγεσταίων τε πρέσβεις παρόντες καὶ προθυμότερον ἐπικαλούμενοι. ὁμοιοι γὰρ ὄντες τοῖς Σελινουντίοις — ἱκανά. ὧν ἀκούοντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν τε Ἑγεσταίων πολλάκις λεγόντων καὶ τῶν ξυναγορευόντων, ἐψηφίσαντο, &c. The sense is dropped at ἐπικαλούμενοι, and taken up again in the latter part of the paragraph; what is between, is parenthetical.

VIII. Ibid. 10. ὥστε χρὴ σκοπεῖν τινὰ αὐτὰ, καὶ μὴ μετεώρω τε πόλει ἀξιόην κινδυνεύειν, καὶ ἀρχῆς ἄλλης ὀρέγεσθαι, πρὶν ἢν ἔχομεν βεβαιωσάμεθα, εἰ Χαλκιδῆς γ. οὐδ' ἐπὶ Θράκης ἔτη τοσαῦτα ἀφεστῶτες ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἔτι ἀχειρώτοισι εἰσι, καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς κατὰ τὰς ἡπείρους ἐνδοιαστῶς ἀκροῶνται. Καὶ ἄ. τ. seems to require τε in the former part of the sentence. Quere, εἰ Χαλκιδῆς τε, or Χαλκιδῆς τε γε.

IX. Ibid. 17. καὶ ταῦτα ἢ ἐμὴ νεότης καὶ ἄνοια παρὰ φύσιν δοκοῦσα εἶναι ἐς τὴν Πελοποννησίαν δύναμιν λόγοις τε πρέπουσιν ὠμίλησε, καὶ ὀργῇ πίστιν παρασχομένη ἐπίειπεν. The construction is: καὶ ἢ ἐμὴ νεότης—λόγοις τε πρέπουσιν ὠμίλησε, καὶ ὀργῇ πίστιν παρασχομένη ταῦτα ἐπίειπεν. Ταῦτα belongs to ἐπίειπεν exclusively.

So c. 22. ἦν τινα (ὀπλίτην) ἐκ Πελοποννήσου δυνάμεθα ἢ πείσαι ἢ μισθῶ προσαγαγέσθαι, where πείσαι τινα ἐκ Πελοποννήσου would not be Greek. (18. ἐξ ἧς (πολεμίας γῆς) κρατεῖν δεῖ ἢ μὴ βλάβας ἀποχωρεῖν. VIII. 15. τὰ χίλια τάλαντα, ὧν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ πολέμου ἐγγίχοντο μὴ ἀψέσθαι, εὐθύς ἔλυσαν τὰς ἐπικειμένας ζημίας τῷ εἰπόντι ἢ ἐπιψηφίσαντι, ὑπὸ τῆς παρούσης ἐκπλήξεως, καὶ ἐψηφίσαντο κινεῖν. Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ii. 226. Into this wild abyss the wary Fiend Stood on the brink of Hell, and look'd awhile, Pond'ring his voyage.

X. Ibid. 51. Καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετραμμένων, οἱ στρατιῶται πυλίδι τινα ἐνφοδομένην κακῶς ἔλαθον διελόντες, καὶ ἐσελθόντες, ἡγόραζον ἐς τὴν πόλιν. Schol. ἡγόραζον (ἐς τὴν πόλιν) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀγορᾷ διέτριβον. It is remarkable that Bekker, whether from conjecture or on the authority of manuscripts, omits the words ἐς τὴν πόλιν in the heading of the above scholium; from which omission we are led to suspect that Bekker was aware of the true construction of the passage. All the other commentators appear to agree in connecting the words ἐς τὴν πόλιν with ἡγόραζον, and most of them point the passage as above. The true order of the construction is, καὶ ἐσελθόντες ἐς τὴν πόλιν, ἡγόραζον "they entered the town and began marketing," i. e. purchasing provisions.

XI. Ibid. 54. ἐπετήδευσαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ τύραννοι οὗτοι ἀρετὴν καὶ ξύνεσιν. The meaning of Thucydides is not, as Mitford for instance renders the words, "these tyrants singularly cultivated wisdom and virtue," but "these men cultivated virtue and prudence more than any other tyrants on record."

Osmyn the Caliph (as old writers tell)

Ruled, for a tyrant, admirably well.

• Crabbe's *Tales of the Hall*.

This use of the particle δὴ, which has been noticed in a former article, is frequent in Thucydides, and its occurrence in this place is decisive of the meaning of the passage.

XII. Id. vii. 2. ὁ δὲ Γέτα τό τε τεῖχος ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ τῶν Σικελίων ἐλόν, καὶ ξυνταξαμένος ὡς ἐς μάχην, ἀφικνεῖται ἐς τὰς Ἐπιπολάς. (Bekker.) Whatever becomes of Γέτα, τότε seems to be the true reading. This use of τότε, when the thread of a narrative is to be resumed, is familiar to the readers of Thucydides. V. 6, init. ὁ δὲ Κλέων, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Τωρώνης τότε περιέπλευσεν ἐς τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν, — Σταγείρῳ μὲν προσβάλλει, &c. So viii. 31. 86, &c.

XIII. Id. viii. 64. καὶ γὰρ καὶ φυγὴ αὐτῶν (τῶν ἐν ἑλῶσι

δλίγων sc.) ἦν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων παρὰ τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις, καὶ αὕτη μετὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπιτηδείων κατὰ κράτος ἔπρασσε ναῦς τε κομίσαι· καὶ τὴν Θάσον ἀποστῆσαι. This use of φυγὴ illustrates Eurip. Med. 12, according to Elmsley's reading: οὐδ' ἂν—κατῴκει τῇνδε γῆν Κορινθίαν (Medea) — ἀνδάνουσα μὲν Φυγὴ πολλίταις, ὧν ἀφίκετο χθόνα, Αὕτη δὲ πάντα συμφέρουσ' Ἰάσονι, where the last line, at least as interpreted by Elmsley, shows that φυγὴ is more than a mere exegesis.

XIV. Hesiod. Ἑργ. 112. ὥς δὲ θεοὶ ζώεσκον. ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, Νόσφιν ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ οἰζύος. "Non ἄτερτε, quod merito improbat, sed ἄτερθε legendum:—nisi quis cum Gueto mallet ἄτεργε." V. D. ap. Obs. Misc. T. i. V. ii. p. 317, "nulla ratione, si quid video, gravi permotus," says Krebsius, ap. Loesner. in loc.; and so Gaisford: "Neutra emendatio necessaria videtur." Was he offended by the position of τε before κακῶν, the laws of grammar requiring, in his opinion, either ἄτερ πόνων τε καὶ οἰζύος, or ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ ἄτερ οἰζύος, as in v. 91. νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνου? If such was his objection, it appears to be satisfactorily answered by the recurrence of the same arrangement v. 123, (repeated 259,) οἳ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα. Plat. Hipp. Maj. 55. ὦ Ἰππία φίλε, σὺ μὲν μακάριος εἶ, ὅτι τε οἶσθα ἃ χρὴ ἐπιτηδεύειν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἐπιτετήδευκας ἱκανῶς, ὥς φῆς· where the accurate Heindorf, after observing, "Pro ὅτι τε οἶσθα accuratius legeremus ὅτι οἶσθα τε," qualifies his remark by subjoining, "quanquam hoc τε negligentius interdum locatur." Demosth. Philipp. v. p. 154. Reiske. μὴ γὰρ οἶσθε, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς αὐτοῖς χαίρειν τε Φίλιππον καὶ τοὺς ἀρχομένους. In Thucydides this collocation of τε is very common: the following instances are exactly parallel to that of Hesiod. iii. 18. πληγέντες ὑπὸ τε τῶν Ἀντισσαίων καὶ τῶν ἐπικυρῶν not by the Antissæans and—~~καὶ~~ mercenaries severally, but by a body composed of the two, as the context shows. 28, init. iv. 8. σφεῖς δὲ (ἡλπιζον) ἄνευ τε κινδύνου καὶ ναυμαχίας ἐκπολιορκήσεν τὸ χωρίον. 35. ταλαιπωρούμενοι ὑπὸ τε τῆς βράχης καὶ δίφους καὶ ἡλίου.

XV. Id. ibid. 113. οὐδέ τι δειλὸν Γῆρας ἐνῆν. Hesiod, we think, would have written (or rather chanted) ἐνέην. Quere ἐην?

XVI. Ibid. 130. ἀλλ' ἑκατὸν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα παρὰ μητέρῃ κεννῇ Ἐτρέφετ' ἀτάλλων, μέγα νήπιος. The first syllable of ἀτάλλων is

¹ Simonidis Fr. ccxli. Gaisf. οὐ τις ἄνευ τε θεῶν ὑπερὶν λάβειν. Qu. ?

short by nature, and no reason can be given for lengthening it here. Some Mss. have ἀττάλλων, (Gaisf. in not.) which we suspect to be the true reading. Ἀττάλλων for ἀτιτάλλων (another form of ἀτάλλειν) appears to be analogous to ἀππέμψει for ἀποπέμψει, Hom. Od. xv. 82. οὐδὲ τις ἡμεᾶς Αὐτῶς ἀππέμψει. (Wolf.) Having noticed this latter passage, we take the opportunity of restoring the true Homeric rhythm in the verse immediately following, ἥε τινα τριπόδων εὐχάλακων, ἥε λεβήτων, by correcting εὐχάλακων. We have shown on a former occasion, that a molossus in this situation occurs very rarely in the Iliad, and in the Odyssey scarcely at all; five out of the six instances there quoted being formed by one and the same word, and that an adjective derived from a proper name. To the above instances ought, however, to have been added, xxi. 15. τῷ δ' ἐν Μεσσήνῃ ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλοισιν, itself remarkable on another account. Hom. II. in Bacch. 36. ἰδρύποτος κελάρυζ' εὐωδῆς, ὠρνυτο δ' ὁδμή, we would connect εὐωδῆς. (Hesiod. Theogon. 250. Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ εὐειδῆς Γαλάτεια, read εὐφειδῆς.) Hes. Ergy. 395. οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω. ἐργάζεω, νήπιε Πέρση it can hardly be doubted that Hesiod wrote ἐεργάζεω.

XVII. Ibid. 661. ἤματα πεντήκοντα μετὰ τροπᾶς ἡελίοιο Ὀραιοῦ πέλεται θνητοῖς πλῆος· οὔτε κε νῆα Κανάρχαις, οὔτ' ἀνδρας ἀποφθίσειε θάλασσα, Εἰ μὴ δὴ πρόρρων γε Ποσειδάων ἐνυσίχθων Ἥ Ζεὺς ἀνάντων βασιλεὺς ἐθέλῃσιν ὀλέσσαι. “εἰ δὴ μὴ Med. Voss. 1. Gal.” Gaisford. The latter, we think, expresses more accurately the meaning of the poet; an exception, ‘as it were, to a general rule, subjoined by the way, and for completeness’ sake: “at least, if it should not so happen that Neptune or Jupiter has some special design against them.”

XVIII. Ibid. 554. χάσαστο δὲ φρένας, ἀμφιχόλος δέ μιν ἵκετο θυμόν. Read, for the sake of the verse, χάσαστο δὲ φρένας ἀμφι, χόλος δέ μιν ἵκετο θυμόν. Hom. II. in Apoll. 273. σὺ δὲ φρένας ἀμφιγεγεθῶς Δέξαι· ἱερὰ καλὰ.

XIX. Ibid. 915. Μνημοσύνης δ' ἐξαῦτις ἐράσαστο καλλικόμοιο, Ἐξ ἧς αἱ Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες ἐξεγένοντο Ἑννεά. Read ἐξ ἧς οἱ Μ.

XX. Hom. Od. x. 58. Wolf. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ' ἡδὲ ποτῆτος. The laws of heroic verse demand imperatively that we should read σίτοιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ'. Wolf, like some other excellent scholars, is a little deficient in ear. xxiv. 414. ἀνάντων ἀέλητι θεῶν τὰδε μήσατο ἔργα. The old reading, τὰδε μήσατο,

is in our opinion more Homeric. See, however, Wolf's preface to Homer, p. lxix.

XXI. Virg. Georg. ii. 224. Talem dives arat Capua, et vicina Vesevo Ora jugo, et vacuis Clanius non æquus Acerris. "Scriptum in quodam commentario reperi versus istos a Virgilio ita primum esse recitados atque editos: 'Talem dives arat Capua, et vicina Vesevo Nola jugo:' postea Virgilium petiisse a Nolanis aquam uti duceret in propinquum rus; Nolanos beneficium petitum non fecisse: poetam offensum nomen urbis eorum, quasi ex hominum memoria; sic ex carmine suo derasisse, *orae*que pro *Nola* mutasse—." We are no believers in gossip, whether retailed by Aulus Gellius or Sir Nathaniel Wraxall; but there is an awkwardness in the use of *ora* as employed here, and an appropriateness in *Nola*, placed as it is between two other proper names of the same kind, which almost convince us that Gellius's story is so far true, that Virgil originally wrote *Nola*, and afterwards, from whatever cause, altered it to *Ora*.

XXII. Id. Æn. v. 97. Totque sues, totidem nigrantes terga juvencos. Jahn, in his 12mo edition of Virgil, 1825, reads *totidemque*, on the sole authority, as far as appears, of two of Burmann's Mss. (See the various readings of Heyne.) He alleges no reason for this alteration, and we are therefore driven to conjecture that his objection to the common reading is founded on the omission of the copulative in a place where it might have been expected: The copulative, however, is no more required here, than Georg. iii. 480. Et genus omne neci pecudum dedit, omne ferarum, *Corripitque* lacus, *infecit* pabula tabo; and numerous other passages, in which *que* appertains, not to the particular verb or noun in whose company it is found, but to the whole of that portion of the sentence in which it is situated. Add to which, that the first syllable of *nigrans* is uniformly long in Virgil, and that the structure of the verse before us, according to Jahn's emendation, is of a kind which Virgil appears to have studiously (we ought rather to say instinctively) avoided, except in such cases as Æn. viii. 548. *pars cætera prona fertur aqua, segnisque secundo defluit amni*, (repeated in Virgil's usual manner, with a variation, from Georg. iii. 447.) where the sound is evidently intended to be a reflection of the sense.

XXIII. Æn. vi. 61. Jam tandem Italiæ fugientis prendimus oras. We have little doubt that Virgil wrote, according to the

- reading of some of the Mss. (octo Burmanni codices, Heyne, Var. Lect.) *fugientes*. The common reading has an air of slovenliness about it which is very unlike Virgil; and the change from *eis* to *is* was an easy one.

XXIV. *Æn.* x. 530. *Turris erat, &c.—dum se glomerant, retroque residunt In partem quæ peste caret: tum pondero turris Procubuit subito, et cælum tonat omne fragore.* Is this borrowed from a somewhat similar incident in *Thucydides*? *iv.* 115. *πύργον ξύλινον ἐπ' οἴκημα ἀντέστησαν, καὶ ὕδατος ἀμφορέας πολλοὺς καὶ πῖδους ἀνεφόρησαν καὶ λίθους μεγάλους, ἄνθρωποι τε πολλοὶ ἀνέβησαν. τὸ δὲ οἴκημα λαβὼν μείζον ἄχθος ἑξαπίνης κατεβράγχη, καὶ φόβου πολλοῦ γενομένου, &c.* This may be thought fanciful, and perhaps is so; yet we have sometimes been inclined to suspect that the footsteps of Virgil may be traced in *Thucydides* to a greater extent than the commentators on the former are aware. *Thucyd.* vi. 31. *init.* *embarkation of the Athenians for Sicily: καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ, ὡς ἦδη ἔμελλον μετὰ κινδύνου ἀλλήλους ἀπολιπεῖν, μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἐσθλὴ τὰ θεινὰ —.* So *Æn.* viii. 554. on a similar occasion: *Fama volat, parvam subito delata per urbem, Ocius ire equites Tyrreni ad limina regis. Vota metu duplicant matres, propiusque periclo* It timor, et major Martis jam apparet imago. *Thucyd.* vii. 29. *account of the sacking of Mycalessus: καὶ τότε ἄλλη τε ταραχὴ οὐκ ὀλίγη καὶ ἰδέα πᾶσα καθεστῆκε ὀλέθρου, καὶ, &c.* *Æn.* ii. 388. *crudelis ubique Luctus, ubique pavor, et plurima mortis imago.* *Thucyd.* iv. 11. *πάντων δὲ φανερώτατος Βρασίδας ἐγένετο. τριηραρχῶν γάρ, καὶ ὁρῶν τοῦ χωρίου χαλεποῦ ὄντος τοὺς τριηράρχους καὶ κυβερνήτας, εἴ πῃ καὶ δοκοίη δυνατόν εἶναι σχεῖν, ἀποκνοῦντας, καὶ φυλασσομένους τῶν νεῶν, μὴ ξυντρίψωσιν, ἐβόα λέγων ὡς οὐκ εἰκὸς εἶη ξύλων φειδομένους τοὺς πολεμίους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ περιιδεῖν τεῖχος πεποιημένους, ἀλλὰ τὰς τε σφετέρας ναῦς, βιαζομένους τῇ ἀπόβασιν, καταγνῦναι ἐκέλευε, καὶ τοὺς ἑυμμάχους μὴ ἀποκνήσαι ἀντὶ μεγάλων εὐεργεσιῶν τὰς ναῦς τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἐπιδουναί, ὁκείλαντας δὲ καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀποβάντας τῶν τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ τοῦ χωρίου κρατῆσαι.* Compare *Æn.* x. 290. *Speculatus littora Tarcho, Qua vada non spirant, nec fracta remurmurat unda, Sed mare inoffensum crescenti allabitur aestu, Advertit subito proram, sociosque precatur: Nunc, o lecta manus, validis incumbite remis; Tollite, ferte rates: inimicam findite rostris Hanc terram, sulcumque sibi premat ipsa carina. Frangere nec tali puppim statione recuso, Arrepta tellure semel.* We do not lay much stress on any of these coincidences, except perhaps the last; but it is worth while to have mentioned them.

XXV. *Æn.* xi. 735. Quo ferrum, quidve hæc gerimus tela irrita dextris? This is commonly interpreted as if *gerimus* were to be understood after *quo*. It were better perhaps to point as follows: Quo ferrum? quidve hæc gerimus tela irrita dextris? as *Hor. Sat. i. 6. 24.* Quo tibi, Tulli, Sumere depositum clavum, fierique tribunum?

XXVI. Bentleius de *Metris Terentianis*, p. ii. "Varro quidem apud Gellium xviii. 15. scribit observasse se in versu *hexametro*, quod *omnimodo quintus semipes* (id est, prior pedis tertii syllaba) *versum finiret*. Mirum, quod *omnimodo* dixerit, cum Lucretius jam tum variaverit,

Reddenda in ratioque vocare, et semina rerum :
et Catullus,

Omnia fanda nefanda sacro permissa furore.

Postea sæpius Virgilius,

Lyrnessi domus alta, solo Laurente sepulcrum.

Homerus autem olim sæpissime,

Ὀλομένην ἢ μολρ' Ἀχαιῶς ἀλγε' ἔθηκεν.

Non *omnimodo* igitur dictum oportuit, sed *plerumque*."

The true statement of the case is, that the *casura* in question is properly and essentially Greek; that it occurs comparatively seldom in the Latin poets, (e. g. in the first hundred lines of the *Iliad* about forty times, in those of the *Æneid* not once;) and that in a large proportion of the passages where it does occur, an imitation of the Greek rhythm is evidently intended; as in the case of Greek proper names: *Ov. Met. ii. 578.* Populifer Spercheos, et irrequietus Enipeus. *Virg. Æn. viii. 440.* *Ætnæi Cyclopes*, et huc advertite mentem. Frequently, indeed, the entire line is constructed on the Greek model; as *Catull. Nupt. Pel. et Thet. 292.* Flammati Phaethontis, et aëria cupressu. *Virg. Æn. ix. 571.* Turnus Ityn, Cloniumque, Dioxippum, Promolumque. *Stat. Theb. iv. 298.* Monstriferamque Erymanthon, et ærisonam Stymphalon. This happens sometimes, though rarely, where the verse is composed of words purely Latin: *Æn. iv. 486.* Spargens humida mella, soporiferumque papaver. In other places it is used to express tumult, hurry, violent emotion, or a rapid succession of circumstances: as *Lucret. iii. 847.* Horrida contremuere sub altis ætheris aureis. *Virg. Georg. iii. 107.* Et proni dant lora, volat vi fervidus axis. 150. Diffugiunt armenta, furit mugitibus æther. *Æn. vii. 465.* Nec jam se capit unda, volat vapor ater ad auras. xi. 900. It has also a *paramiac* character; as *Catull. lxii. 16.* Jure igitur vincemur: amat victoria curam. *Virg. Ecl. ii. 65.* Finally, it is more than usually frequent in some of the *Eclogues* of Virgil,

doubtless from an imitation of the flow of Theocritus. All these circumstances indicate that the structure in question is foreign to the constitution of the Latin hexameter, inasmuch as it is seldom employed except for a particular cause.

ΒΟΛΥΤΟΣ.

NOTICES OF FOREIGN WORKS.

Juliani Imperatoris quæ feruntur Epistolæ. Accedunt ejusdem Fragmenta breviora cum Poematiis, nec non Galli Cæsaris ad Julianum fratrem Epistola. Ed. L. H. HEYLER. Græce et Latine. 8vo. Moguntiae, 1828.

THE distinguished scholar, Dan. Wytttenbach, who lately died at Leyden, (Prof. Hanhart of the University of Basel in Switzerland is preparing for the press at this moment a biography of his countryman) intended to publish a new edition of the works of Julian. Already in 1769 appeared his *Epistola Critica super nonnullis locis Juliani Imperatoris*, at Gottingen; and since *Animadversiones in selecta Juliani loca*, in the *Bibliotheca Critica Amstelodamensis*, Part 1. p. 33 sqq. and Part 11. p. 1 sqq.; but the public have been disappointed with respect to the whole works of Julian, which Wytttenbach never found leisure to complete. Ezech. Spanheim's edition of 1696, Lipsiæ, Tomi 11. fol. is the last edition of Julian's works, has become exceedingly scarce: hence J. F. Boissonade advised Mr. Heyler to prepare a new edition. The volume already published contains 83 letters of Julian, the original text, with a Latin translation, p. 3—150: then follow the fragments, p. 151—154; and Poemata, p. 155, 156; and last, the *Epistola Galli Cæsaris*, which, however, was considered as spurious by Petavius. In p. 161—548, follow *Observationes in Juliani Imperatoris quæ feruntur epistolas, fragmenta breviora, et poemata*: then an index epistolarum cum argumentis, alphabetically arranged according to the names of the persons to whom the letters are directed, p. 549—554; with an index nominum propriorum in Juliani textu obviatorum, p. 555—559: then an index grammaticus; and last of all, an index scriptorum veterum quorum loca vel emendantur, vel illustrantur, vel Juliano præluxisse judicantur. Of the Codd. Mss. of which Heyler availed himself, eight are at Paris in the royal library, and one at Munich. The British

Museum possesses also a Cod. Chartaceus of the Epist. of Julian; but it is incomplete, like all the other Codd., and contains only 17 letters. The letter to the Alexandrians, p. 110. ed. Heyleri, breaks off at the words *τί οὖν*, and goes on to *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐλοιδοροῦ τότε*, as all the editions had it, before Muratori published the *Anecdota Græca* Petavii, 1709. The critical notes to the present edition are so copious and elaborate, and so eminently useful, that we sincerely wish the editor might soon present us with the rest of Julian's works. We remark, however, that the Latin translation has not been revised carefully enough: the words *καὶ ἀδιάρθρωτον* are omitted, p. 11; likewise *ἐν τοίχῳ περιφερῇ*, p. 36. and *ἀντεχόμενοι τοῦ τύρου*, p. 92. are incorrectly given by "*præ arrogancia resistunt*;" *ἀντέχειν* means *resistere*, but the Mid. *ἀντέχομαι* *adhærere*, *pertinax esse*. The following works on Julian, which appeared some time ago on the continent, deserve notice:—*Ueber den Kaiser Julianus und sein zeitalter. Ein historisches gemälde von A. Neander*, Leipzig, 1812. *Histoire de l'Empereur Julien tirée des auteurs idolâtres et confirmée par ses propres écrits. Par M. Jondot*, Paris, 1827, 2 vols: 8vo. *Œuvres complètes de l'Empereur Julien traduites pour la première fois du Grec en Français, accompagnées d'argumens et de notes par R. Tourlet*, Paris, 1821, 3 vols.

Luciani Alexander, Græce. Prolegomenis instruxit, annotationem et excursus adjecit, C. G. JACOB. Coloniae ad Rhenum, 1828.

Lehmann's edition of Lucian has not answered the expectations of the learned in Germany. It is too voluminous for the student, and not critical enough for the scholar. The text is yet far from being correct; and for the purpose of illustrating the contents, Lehmann has added little of his own to the notes of Solanus, Gesnerus, and Reitzius. We understand that F. V. Fritsche, a pupil of Hermann, intends publishing the whole of Lucian; and from the specimens he has already given, (*Alexander*, *Demonax*, *Gallus*, *Icaromenippus*, *Philopseudes*, Lips. 1826; *Dialogi Mortuorum*, Lips. 1827,) we have reason to believe that his edition will far surpass that of his predecessor. Meantime, Mr. Jacob, who published already, 1825, *Toxaris Gr.* continues also his critical study of Lucian. The *Prolegomena*, p. 17—37, contain an able historical introduction to the subject: valuable information is given, cap. 4. de *Cercopibus*; cap. 6.

de chronographis et logographis; cap. 7. 15. 30. 38. 39. 47. de serpentium cultu aliisque sædis superstitionibus; cap. 17. 56. de personis Lucianæis; cap. 48. de rebus M. Antonini philosophi. We observe on the words p. 87. "*sunt quod probe tenendum*, Christiani ἄθεοι," that not the slightest doubt can exist, as to whether the word ἄθεοι applies to the Christians. For the Emperor Julian, in his letter to Arsacius, p. 90. edit. Heyleri, says: Γαλιλαίων . . . (Χριστιανῶν) ἀσεβοῦντων μὲν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, ἀθεό-τητα δὲ θεοσεβείας προτιμώντων. Excursus 1. treats de recta nominum propriorum in libris Lucianæis scriptura, p. 115—136. Exc. 11. de negatione οὐ tum male adjecta, tum male omissa, p. 137—42; and the whole concludes with an index rerum et verborum.

Res Cyrenensium a primordiis inde civitatis usque ad ætatem qua in provinciæ formam a Romanis est redacta, novis curis illustravit Dr. J. P. THIRIGGE. Hafniæ, 1828. pp. 371. 8vo.

The author of this work published in 1819 *Historia Cyrenes*, pars i. Hafniæ. Since that time he continued his researches until his premature death in 1827. The present work, which he left in a state fit for publication, renders the former useless. He treats in the beginning *de fontibus historiæ Cyrenensis*, and *de situ et natura regionis Cyrenaicæ*. Then he divides his work in five sections: *Sectio prima*. De Colonia ex Laconia Theram conducta; de Colonia ex Thera Cyrenen deducta; de tempore quo Cyrene sit condita. *Sectio secunda*. Res Cyrenensium, et forma reipublicæ Cyrenensis. Res Cyrenes, Battiadis regnantibus complexa. *Sectio tertia*. Res Cyrenes, liberæ civitatis comprehendens. *Sectio quarta*. De rebus Cyrenensium inde ab eo tempore quo a Ptolemæo expugnata regio est, usque ad ævum quo in provinciæ formam a Romanis est redacta. *Sectio quinta*. De rebus sacris, moribus, et studiis Cyrenensium. Then follow several interesting chapters on the commerce, revenues, arts, and literature of the inhabitants of Cyrene.

Timæi Sophistæ Lexicon Vocum Platonicarum, ex Cod. Ms. Sangermanensi primum edidit, atque animadversionibus illustravit DAVID RUHNKENIUS. Editio Nova. Curavit GEORG. ÆNOTHEUS KOCH, Ph. Doct., Lipsiæ, 1828. pp. 260. 8vo.

The Lexicon of Timæus is not merely reprinted from Ruhnken's edition, but the new editor has availed himself of the

notes of Toup, Fischer, Porson, Bast, and of Villosion, who collated the Cod. after Montfaucon and Capperonmerius. He gives also frequent references to Schæfer, Lobeck, Bekker, and others, whenever their remarks bear upon the Lex. of Timæus. Koch intends publishing an appendix to the Glossary, where those words of Timæus, which Ruhnken could not find in Plato will be supported by the passages to which they refer, such as ἔδος, ῥυμβεῖν, &c. The text of the Glossary will also be given more correct. We cannot understand why this has not been done in this new edition, especially where the true reading is placed beyond doubt; ad p. 76. ad voc. Δρόμοι. ἡ περίπατος, where the conjecture of Bastius, Ep. Crit. p. 56. οἱ περίπατοι holds evidently good. But then a separate appendix would become useless. We are also promised a new edition of the fragments of Parmenides.

Æsthetica Literaria Antiqua Classica, sive Antiquorum Scriptorum cum Græcorum tum Latinorum de arte literaria præcepta et placita ordine systematico disposita, adnotationibusque passim instructa a JOSEPHO HILLEBRAND. Moguntiae, 1828.

Such passages have been selected from the Greek and Latin writers, as establish and elucidate the rules of Rhetoric and Poetry, and put into systematical order. We ought surely to study the precepts of those who have handed down to posterity such admirable models of eloquence and of poetry. We conceive therefore the plan of the present work to be very commendable.

Pars prima treats, cap. I. de pulchritudine (τὸ καλόν): Plat. Phil. et Symp. Xenoph. Mem. l. iii. c. 8, 4. et l. iv. c. 6, 9. Aristot. Poet. cap. 8. ed. Bip. D. Laert. vii. 99, 100. Plotin. de pulchritud.—Cap. II. de sublimitate: Long. περὶ ὕψους. de ridiculo: Aristot. Rhet. l. i. 111. c. 18. Quintil. Inst. Orat. l. vi. c. 3. ed. Spalding. de miseratione: Aristot. Rhet. l. ii. c. 8. ed. Bip. cap. 111. de artibus in genere: Plat. de legg. 11. p. 71 et 72. Aristot. Poet. c. 1. Longin. sect. xxii. § 1. Cicero de Orat. l. i. 111. c. 51. et passim. Quintil. Inst. Or. l. ii. c. 17. et passim. In the same manner passages are judiciously selected for *Pars Secunda*, which treats, sect. 1. A. de elocutione in universum, cap. 1. de simplicis elocutionis virtutibus, cap. 2. de elocutionis varietate atque differentia, cap. 3. de elocutionis decoro. B. de materia dicendi universa. cap. 1. de affectibus, cap. 2. de moribus, c. 3. de simili sive comparabili. Sect. 2. A. de

arte poetica. I. de universa artis poeticæ natura. c. 1. de poeseos notione, cap. 2. de elocutione poetica. II. de artis poeticæ varietate et generibus. c. 1. de divisione poematum. c. 2. de genere poeseos dramatico (tragœdia, comœdia). c. 3. de genere poeseos enuntiativo s. ἀπαγγελτικῷ. c. 4. de genere poeseos communi (epopeia, bucolica). B. de arte rhetorica. I. de arte rhetorica in universum. c. 1. de rhetorices notione, fine et utilitate. c. 2. de elocutione rhetorica s. prosaica in genere. II. de arte rhetorica in specie. c. 1. de genere oratorio. c. 2. de reliquis artis prosaicæ generibus, (de genere didactico, historico, de forma dialogica) Appendix. I. de memoria et pronuntiatione. II. de via ac ratione comparandi artis oratoriæ facultatem.

ERN. FRID. CAR. ROSENMÜLLERI *Theol. Doct. Scholia in Vetus Testamentum redacta. Volumen Primum, Scholia in Pentateuchum continens.* Lipsiæ, 1828.

“Auctor fui,” says Roscsm. in the Preface, “J. Ch. S. Lechnero in sacrarum literarum studio dextre versato, e Commentario nostro, quæ ad sensum verborum et loquendi formularum, in quibus aliquid difficultatis sit explicandum, atque ad res gestas, ritus antiquos, nomina personarum locorumque et similia illustranda maxime necessaria essent, seligeret, haud omissa, in locis difficilioribus mentione et aliarum interpretationum quæ quidem sua sese probabilitate commendarent, et lectionis variantis, sicuti ea majoris momenti esset; pleniorum vero antiquarum et recentiorum interpretationum enarrationem, earumque examen, atque plurium variarum lectionum recensum, majori operi relinqueret. Ego quæ viæ doctiss. ea, quam dixi, ratione in compendium redegit, omnia non solum diligenter recognovi, verum et quæ hic illic minus recte a me dicta fuisse animadverteterem, correxi, subinde etiam, ubi opus videretur, novas observationes addidi, atque quæ ab eo inde tempore, quo Scholia in Pentateuchum tertio prodierunt, edita sunt scripta recentia, quæ quidem in rem nostram facerent, suis locis laudavi, &c.”

Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica. Ad fidem Librorum Manuscriptorum et Editionum Antiquarum recensuit, integram lectionis varietatem et annotationes adjecit, scholia aucta et emendata indicesque locupletissimos addidit, AUGUSTUS WELLAUER. Vol. 1. et II. Lips. 1828.

From Henricus Stephanus down to the time of Brunck,

Apoll. Rhod. seems to have been much neglected. Hoelzein and Shaw deserve hardly any mention as editors. Brunck, who published a new edition of this author, was not in possession of the best Codd. when he began his work; and he did not even think it worth while to give the various readings in the appendix, after those Codd. had been collated for him. Brunck was a bold and acute critic; but the progress in grammatical and metrical knowledge which has been made since his time, has shown that his *ὀβελος* was not always judiciously employed. Flangin, Beck, and Hoerstel have edited Apoll. Rhod. after him; but Beck followed Brunck too closely; Flangin did not collate early enough the Codd. Vatic.; and Hoerstel ought to have remembered the adage—"Non ex quo-vis ligno fit Mercurius."

The present editor has availed himself, 1. of the *Cod. Medicus*, which had been collated for Heyne; 2. of the *Codd. Vatican.* A. B. C. D. of which he has given all the various readings from the edit. of Flanginius; 3. of the *Cod. Guelpherbyt.*, the various readings of which are all contained in Hoerstel's edit.; 4. of the *Cod. Vratisl.*; 5. of five *Codd. Parisiens.* He has besides carefully examined the Florence edit. of Apoll. Rhod. of 1496; the Aldine of 1521; and the Paris edit. of 1541. The Francfort edit. (1546) and the Basil edit. (1572) agree, three or four passages excepted, with the Aldine. The editor is also much indebted to the *Lectio Apolloniana* of Gerhard. After the text are given the *Scholia Vulgat.*, because the *Scholia Paris.* have turned out to be much inferior. Most useful will prove the *Index Verborum*, which is carefully composed. p. 191—318. vol. ii.

J. G. L. ROSEGARTEN *Chrestomathia Arabice ex Codicibus Manuscriptis Parisiensibus, Gothanis et Berolinensibus collecta atque adscriptis vocalibus tum additis Lexico et adnotationibus explanata.* Lipsiæ, 1828.

The study of oriental languages can be much facilitated by proper reading books, which lead on the student progressively from the easy to the difficult; and where a small glossary, accompanied by notes, can supply the place of an expensive lexicon. The compiler of the present work, a professor of Arabic at Greifswald, has, we think very judiciously, only selected such specimens from Arabic writers as are written in the style most frequently used in poetry and prose. Grammatical difficulties

are either solved in the notes, or reference is given to the grammars of Sacy, Rosenmüller, and Tychsen.

Anthologie Arabe, or a collection of inedited Arabic poetry, translated into French, by M. Grangeret de la Grange, in 8vo.. Paris, 10 fr.

M. Grangeret de la Grange is under-librarian at the library of the Arsenal at Paris, and one of the most distinguished pupils of the Baron Silvestre de Sacy. The book which he now publishes is in many respects an important work : the 1st part being particularly deserving the attention of orientalists, as it is composed of various pieces extracted from the *Diwans* of Motenabbi, who was born at Kufah, in the beginning of the 4th century of the *Hejra*. Motenabbi clothed his poetic compositions with all the brilliancy of which the Arabic language is susceptible. He was profound and luminous ; his genius created, as it were, additional richness to a language already so prodigious in resources. Three centuries after him came *Ebn Faredh*, who was placed in almost the same pre-eminence with him. He was born in Cairo in the 577th year of the *Hejra*. The modern Egyptians never pronounced his name but with enthusiasm.

Nouvelle édition de la Byzantine, being a collection of the *Byzantine Historians*, more complete and correct than any preceding edition, arranged after the plan of B. G. Niebühr, and executed by him, with other philologists, and published by Edward Weber. Bonn.

This is to be the most exact collection that has hitherto appeared of the Byzantine historians, rendered still more interesting by the present political circumstances of Europe. It is generally known, among the learned, that the Louvre collection of the Byzantine historians is so extremely expensive, that most persons are deprived of the means of enriching their libraries with it. The Latin and Greek text will be printed in the same page, and there will be two indexes at the end of each work, one for the matter, the other for the language. The progress of this important work will be supervised by N. Niebühr, counsellor of state to the King of Prussia, &c. The price of each vol. of 480 large 8vo. pages, will be 8½ francs. On the 1st of Jan. 1829, the price will be raised. The maps and plans are to be paid for separately, and each author may be separately sold. A vol. will appear every two months. Subscriptions are taken, without payment in advance, at Bonn, and at Paris, at N. Maze's, Rue de Seine, Saint-Germain, No. 31.

Horæ Syriacæ, seu Commentationes et Anecdota res vel literas Syriacas spectantia, auctore Nicolai Wiseman, S. R. D. in Archigymn. Rom. LL. OO. Profess. in Collegio vero Anglorum prærectore et SS.LL. iustitutore. In 8vo. Rome, 1828.

Every one knows how the question has been agitated between the Catholics and the Protestants respecting the interpretation of that fa-

mous passage of the gospel,¹ *Hoc est corpus meum, hic est sanguis meus*, by which the Divine Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist.

All the oriental languages used in Palestine at the time of Jesus Christ are incontestably figurative: viz. the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Greek. If the words *hoc est* had been delivered in English or in Latin, we might perhaps have supposed that our Saviour's intention was to express himself literally, but in the Syriac, (the language in which Christ spoke,) the expressions of the idea *signify, represent*, are wanting, so that we are compelled to interpret it, *This is the symbol or figure of*. Moreover, if an Arab or a Syrian of the present age introduces his friend to another friend, he says, *kadda Ah-köia*, that is to say *this is my brother*, which implies that his friendship for him is paramount to that of a brother; though it be well known and understood by all parties that the person thus introduced, so far from being a brother, is not even a relation, nor yet belonging to the same *kabyla* or tribe: consequently the interpretation must necessarily be, *This is such a friend as is figurative of my brother* or of brotherly love.

Nouvelle Méthode pour étudier l'Hebreu des Saintes Ecritures; a new method for studying the Hebrew of the Holy Scriptures: to which is added a history of Ruth and a vocabulary of Hebrew and French, by the Abbé Beuzelin, in 12mo. Paris, 1827. Dondey Dupré.

This new method has for its basis, a system of transcription of three alphabets of high antiquity, founded on identity, in characters slightly distinguishable: 1st, The primitive alphabet of the Hebrews, known by the name of the ancient Samaritan, which is the same with the *Phœnician*; 2nd, the alphabet of the first or ancient Greeks; and 3rd, that of the first Romans. The author exposes the identity of these different characters in a tone dogmatical enough, and, as it were, by aphorisms, without giving himself the trouble to demonstrate the correspondences of sounds and forms, which he gives as proved, but which, however, ought to serve as a basis to his new method.—There are three methods most generally adopted for learning the Hebrew language; the 1st is that of the *vowel points*, a method constantly followed by all the synagogues, and generally by all the Catholic colleges; the 2nd is after the well-known system of *Masclaf*, which is followed more particularly by the Protestant colleges; the 3rd, which may be considered as only philologic and drawn from the very nature of the language itself, because in considering it as a dialect of the Arabic we follow no other system of pronunciation and of vowels than that which is fixed by analogy and by the Arabian grammarians.

These three systems may, more or less, directly conduct to the well understanding of the Hebrew. That of *Masclaf*, although it has the appearance of being a shorter way, has been ascertained to be subject to many difficulties; the system of *vowel points* has been without doubt invented by persons who were very learned in the Arabic and its dialects; and if it has been considered by some persons as too complicated and insufficient, it was perhaps because it was not fundamentally understood by them. We will not, however, condemn the method of

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28. Mar. xiv. Luc. xxii.

those, who, cultivating the Hebrew after having learned the Arabic, follow in the study of this language, which they consider as a dialect, the grammatical system of the mother tongue. But this mode of proceeding would be inconvenient to those who propose to themselves to obtain a knowledge of the Hebrew language without being willing to cultivate the Arabic; for in this case we are of opinion that the system of vowel points is preferable to all others.

After all, one might ask oneself, (in spite of the different methods for studying Hebrew, which we already possess) whether it would be necessary or very useful to discover new ones; but this is a question that would remove us too far from our principal subject, which is to render an account, as brief as possible, of the work above announced: we should rather inquire if the new *method* proposed by the *Abbé Beuzelin* ought to be adopted in preference to the methods already known? We think not; and will only add, that this work, having for its basis a system of transcription of Hebrew letters into those of Europe, is **RADICALLY DEFECTIVE**. We do not know for what purpose is this transcription and this change; but we confess frankly, that whenever we have met with Hebrew phrases or words, transcribed after the *Abbé's* method, we have had difficulty in comprehending the meaning of them, although the language of the Bible is familiar to us. This fact alone is sufficient to convince us that this book cannot be of any use to those who have already studied the Hebrew; but the author undoubtedly had the intention to facilitate the study of Hebrew to noviciates. Considered in this point of view, it would serve only to embarrass such as would read the sacred books in the original text; for after having learned the language according to the method proposed by the author, they would be obliged to acquire an acquaintance with the forms and graphic system of the Hebrews; so that the labour would become double. This new method therefore, in our opinion, is not recommendable by any kind of utility. —Extract from the critique of *Rosellini*.

PARRIANA.

OUR *Anas* have been but few in comparison with the French, but not many can be compared with our present subject. Our province is of course only with the *classical* part of the memoranda and communications connected with the history and life of Dr. PARR. It has seldom, we believe, happened that so much attention has been paid to the *literary* life of any one man, which, *primâ facie*, is an evidence that what emanated from such a man was great and good. Three different succinct accounts have already appeared relative to Dr. PARR, besides the numerous biographies in periodicals. The first is by Dr. JOHNSTONE, in eight octavo volumes, printed by Mr. Nichols, and intitled "The Works of Samuel Parr, LL.D. Prebendary of St. Paul's, Curate of Hatton, &c. With Memoirs of his Life and Writings,

and a Selection from his Correspondence." The second by the Rev. W. FIELD, in 2 vols. printed by Mr. Valpy, and intitled "Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL.D.; with Biographical Notices of many of his Friends, Pupils, and Contemporaries." And the third by Mr. BARKER, in one vol. (though more vols. we believe are to come,) printed by Mr. Skill, and intitled "Sketches of the late Rev. Samuel Parr, LL.D."

We do not intend to enter into any regular review of these works, but merely to record in our pages whatever may be useful to our *classical* readers. In our present No. we have given some Latin and English inscriptions written by Dr. Parr;¹ and for our next we have reserved some valuable matter, which is interspersed in the various correspondence of Dr. P. with learned men, which will no doubt hereafter influence the classical literature of England.

The following inscriptions are from Mr. FIELD's two volumes :

JOANNI LION,
Prestoniae in Parvicia Harroviensi
Mortuo
SEXT. NON. OCTOBR. ANNO CHRISTI MDXIII.
Et in hac Ecclesia sepulto;
Fundi domino cultorique
Assiduo, frugi, probo,
Sapienti sine via et arte,
Et, quia bonis suis optime uti novit,
Unice fortunato;
Scholæ impensis ejus extractæ,
Et ad pueros Græcis ac Latinis
Literis
Erudiendos institutæ,
Gubernatores, magistri, atque alumni
Hoc monumentum, collata pecunia,
Ponendum curaverunt,
Anno SACRO M.DCCCXV.—(In Harrow Church.)

THOMÆ THACKERAY, S. T. P.
Coll. Regal. apud Cantabr. olim Socio,
Chisseliæ Parvæ atque Haydoniæ
In agro Essexiensi Rectori,
Frederico Principi Valliæ a Sacris,
Archidiacono-Southriensi,
Scholæ Harroviensis per xv. ann. Magistro,
Viro integerrimo, sanctissimo,
Et ad juventutem liberaliter erudiendam
Studio optimarum artium et suavitate morum
Egregie instructo;

¹ Several inscriptions by the same learned scholar will be found in the *Class. Journ.* No. LXIX. pp. 77—83.

Qui,
 Coniuge sui amantissima
 Liberisque xiv. superstitionibus,
 Decessit Londini vii. Cal. Octobr.
 Ann. Domini MDCLX. Ætatis LXVII.
 Et in sepulchro hujus Ecclesiæ
 A latere Occidentali conditus est,
 Nepotes ejus
 Ll. M. hoc Monumentum posuerunt.

JOANNI TAYLOR, S. T. P.
 Langovici nato;
 Albi ostii, in agro Cumbriensi,
 Bonis discipulis instituto;
 Norvici,
 Ad exequendum munus Pastoris delecto A. D. MDCCXXXIII.
 Rigoduni, quo in oppido,
 Senex quotidie aliquid addiscens,
 Theologiam et Philosophiam Moralem docuit;
 Mortuo
 Tert. Non. Mart.
 Anno Domini MDCLXI.
 Ætat. LXVI.
 Viro integro, innocenti, pio;
 Scriptori Græcis et Hebraicis literis
 Probe erudito;
 Verbi divini gravissimo interpreti;
 Religionis simplicis et incorruptæ
 Acerrimo propugnatori;
 Nepotes ejus atque pronepotes,
 In hac capella,
 Cujus ille fundamenta olim jecerat,
 Monumentum hocce honorarium
 Poni curaverunt.
 (In the Octagon Chapel, Norwich.)

DANIELI GACHES, A.M.
 Collegii Regalis in Academia Cantabrigiensi
 Quondam Socius
 Ecclesiæ hujusce per ann. XXXVIII. mens. IX.
 Ministro,
 Irenarchæ, de comitatu Varvicensi
 Optime merito;
 Siquidem æqui et boni peritissimus fuit,
 Et ad nodos legum solvendos
 Quam maxime expeditus:
 Non solum literis Græcis atque Latinis
 Apprime docto,
 Sed etiam vi quadam ingenii,
 Quæ ad excogitandum acuta,
 Et ad memoriam firma atque diuturna erat,
 Egregie prædito:
 Qui vixit Ann. LXXII. mens. VI.
 Decessit IV. Id. Septembr. Anno Sacro MDCCCV.
 Maria Gaches, Coniux ejus superstes,
 H. M. P. S. P. C.—(In Wooten Wawen Church.)

A. ✕ n.

JOANNI SMITHEMAN,
 Qui vix. ann. xv. mens. viii. dies
 Decessit viii. Id. Mart. Anno Sacro
 CIO. DCCCLXXXIII.

JOANNES et MARGARETA SMITHEMAN,
 Parentes infelicissimi,
 Unico et charissimo filio
 Contra votum posuerunt.

CAROLO BURNEIO, LL. D. S.T.P. A.S. R.S. Sodali,
 Græcarum literarum et Latinarum Professori
 In Regia Academia Londinensi,
 Georgio Tertio Britanniarum Regi a Sacris,
 Ecclesiæ Lincolnienſis Præbendario,
 Cliffiæ, et Ecclesiæ D. Pavli Deptfordicis
 In Agro Cantiano Rectori,
 Scholæ Grenovicensis per xviii annos Magistro,
 Qui vixit annos LX. dies xxiv.
 Decessit Quinto Cal. Januar. Anno Sacro CIO. DCCCXIII.
 Et Deptfordiæ sepultus est,
 Discipuli ejus hoc monumentum, pecunia collata, posuerunt
 Inerant in hoc viro
 Plurimæ et reconditæ literæ,
 Judicium artis critica præceptis
 Stilique frequentissima exercitatione limatam
 Et in nodis rei metricæ solvendis,
 Eximia quædam sollertia.
 In libris, quos Latine aut Anglice conscripsit,
 Lucidus erat sententiarum ordo,
 Et sine fuce nitor verborum.
 Sermonem ejus ad magnam
 Et ingenii et doctrinæ opinionem commendabant,
 Motus animi ad excogitandum celeres,
 Vox plena et canora,
 Acies oculorum acerrima illa quidem,
 Sed hilaritate totius vultus suaviter temperata,
 Et argutiæ jucundissimo lepore condita,
 Quum juvenes ad politioſiorem humanitatem informaret,
 Accuratus quoddam et exquisitus docendi genus adhibebat,
 Et in mentibus eorum ad omne officii munus instruendis,
 Personam magistri summa fide et gravitate tuebatur.
 Hæc ad laudes accesserunt
 Singularis vitæ atque naturæ comitas,
 Quæ optimi cujunque benevolentiam conciliabat,
 Et discipulos ad amorem et reverentiam præceptoris sui
 Mirifice alliciebat,
 Assiduam et vehemens studium in promendis consiliis,
 Quæ ludimagistris indigentibus aut senio confectis
 Solatium ac perſugium præbere possent,
 Et digna homine perfecte erudito diligentia
 In comparanda bibliotheca,
 Quæ libris, aliis manu scriptis,
 Aliis e prelo emissis,
 Ita ornata fuit,
 Ut, post mortem possessoris luctuosam
 Emeretur sumtu publico;

Et jussu Anglici Parlamenti
In Britannico Museo collocaretur.
Maxime autem in Burneio elucebant
Voluntas in Anglicam Ecclesiam propensissima,
Spes æternæ salutis pie in Christo posita,
Et consuetudo pure atque caste
Venerandi Deum.

JOANNI BAYNES, A. M.
Collegii S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses socio,
Juveni diserto et sine maledictis faceto,
Vi ingenii ad excogitandum acuta,
Et firma ad memoriam mirifice prædito;
Græcis et Latinis literis penitus imbuto;
Legum Anglicarum interiore
Et recondita disciplina erudito;
Libertatis conservandæ perstudioso;
Patriæ bonorumque civium amantissimo;
Simplici justo et proposito
Animose et fortiter tenaci;
Qui vixit ann. XXVIII. mens. III. dies XXVIII.
Decessit Londini pridie Non. August.
Anno Sacro
MDCCLXXXVIII.
GULIELMUS BAYNES
Contra votum superstes
Filio bene merenti
H. M. P.

RICARDO LUBBOCK, Norvici nato;
Græcis Latinisque literis
Ibidem instituto;
Magnam postea in Academia Edinburgensi
Laudem adepto
Propter ingenii lumen, quod in thesi ejus
De Principio Sorbili conscripta eluxerat;
Viro
Ab omni doctrina liberali et maxime philosophia
Cumulate instructo;
Sermonis comite et suavissimis moribus
Eximie prædito;
De amicis suis et propinquis
Optime merito;
Patriæ amantissimo;
Qui cum in urbe, qua natus fuerat,
Medicinam per XXIII annos
Scienter et perite exercuisset,
Gravi diuturnoque morbo affectus,
Decessit, quarto Non. Septembr.
A. D. MDCCCVIII. æt. XXXVIII.
Brigitta Lubbock, Conjux ejus superstes,
H. M. S. S. P. C.

Aqua ex hoc puteo hausta
Sitim sedavit
RICARDUS TERTIUS, Rex Angliæ,
Cum HENRICO COMITE de RICHMONDIA
Acerrime atque infensissime
Prælians,

Et vita pariter ac sceptro
 Ante noctem cariturus,
 11. Kal. Sept. A. D. MCCCCLXXXV.
 (*Inscribed on King Richard's Well, in Bosworth Field.*)

ENGLISH EPITAPHS, &c.

This Tablet
 Is consecrated to the Memory of the
 Rev. JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL. D.
 By his affectionate Congregation,
 In Testimony
 Of their Gratitude for his faithful Attention
 To their spiritual Improvement,
 And for his peculiar Diligence in training up their youth
 To rational Piety and genuine Virtue :
 Of their Respect for his great and various Talents,
 Which were uniformly directed to the noblest Purposes ;
 And of their Veneration
 For the pure, benevolent, and holy Principles,
 Which through the trying Vicissitudes of Life,
 And in the awful hour of Death,
 Animated him with the hope of a blessed Immortality.
 His Discoveries as a Philosopher
 Will never cease to be remembered and admired
 By the ablest Improvers of Science.
 His Firmness as an Advocate of Liberty,
 And his Sincerity as an Expounder of the Scriptures,
 Endearred him to many
 Of his enlightened and unprejudiced Contemporaries.
 His Example as a Christian
 Will be instructive to the Wise, and interesting to the Good,
 Of every Country, and in every Age.
 He was born at Fieldhead, near Leeds, in Yorkshire,
 March 24, A. D. 1733.
 Was chosen a Minister of this Chapel, Dec. 31, 1780.
 Continued in that Office Ten Years and Six Months.
 Embarked for America, April 7, 1794.
 Died at Northumberland, in Pennsylvania, Feb. 6, 1801.

Sacred to the Memory
 Of GEORGE LOYD, Esq. late of Manchester,
 Barrister,
 Who died at Bath, October the 12th, 1804,
 In the 55th year of his age.
 This excellent man was long and justly endeared
 To his family, by tenderness as a husband, and kindness as a
 father ;
 To his acquaintance, by the gentleness of his temper, and
 suavity of his manners,
 And to his numerous and respectable friends,
 By the ardor, the sincerity, and the steadiness of his attachments.
 In the application of his general knowledge
 To the characters of men, and the events of life,
 He preserved that rare and happy union
 Of correctness and liberality,
 Which is the surest criterion of a mind
 Vigorous from nature,

Comprehensive from reflection,
 And virtuous from principle.
 In the discharge of his professional duties,
 He was deservedly celebrated
 For the soundest judgment and the strictest integrity.
 His conversation was at once agreeable and instructive
 From the quickness and variety of his conceptions,
 The activeness and accuracy of his reasoning,
 And the perspicuity, exactness, and elegance of his diction—
 His patriotism was neither warped by prejudice,
 Nor tainted by faction,
 Nor staggered by real or imaginary danger.
 His benevolence was enlarged without singularity,
 And active without ostentation.
 His fortitude was alike unshaken
 By the pressure of a lingering and complicated disease,
 The consciousness of progressive and incurable blindness,
 And the expectation of approaching death.

CATHERINE JANE PARR, youngest daughter of SAMUEL and JANE PARR, was born at Norwich, June 13th, 1782, died at East Teignmouth, Devon, November 22nd, 1805, and on December 9th was buried in this Chancel, where the remains of her afflicted parents will hereafter be deposited, at the request of a most beloved child, whom they hope to meet again at the Resurrection of the Just to Life Everlasting.

Quæ Templo Catharina in hoc sepulta est,
 " Prudens, casta, decens, severa, dulcis,
 " Discordantia quæ solent putari,
 " Morum commoditate copulavit,
 " Nam vitæ comites bonæ fuerunt
 " Libertas gravis et pudor facetus,"
 His est junctus amor pius snorum,
 Et cura ex animo Deum colendi.

(In Hatton Church, Warwickshire.)

This Translation was dictated by Dr. Parr.

Heredieth interred
 Lieutenant-General SIR JOHN MOORE :
 Created Knight of the Bath by George the Third,
 King of the Britannie Isles
 A Scot by birth.
 A commander heroic in valor,
 Pure from rapacity and avarice,
 And skilful in the whole range of military affairs
 From science aided by experience.
 In Holland, Corsica, Egypt, and the West Indies
 He saw his enemies put to flight.
 While the Spaniards were oppressed by a fell and detestable
 Tyranny, he, with the utmost possible ardor, endeavored
 To defend their rights, their laws, their altars, and
 Their habitations ; and after the vicissitude of prosperous
 And adverse events incident to war, when he with
 Difficulty had made his way to Corunna,
 And when his soldiers were debilitated and exhausted
 By the length of their march, and by hunger, and by cold,
 He roused them by the earnestness of his exhortations,
 And he emboldened them by the courageousness of his example,

To encounter the perils of unequal conflict.
 From the French, when they were confidently relying
 On the number of their forces, and proudly exulting in the
 Peculiar and almost uninterrupted good fortune of
 Their leader, he suddenly snatched the palm of victory.
 Upon the soldiers of the 42nd Regiment,
 Long endeared to him by the participation of common danger,
 And awakened by one short and pithy admonition to
 The remembrance of their successful achievements in Egypt,
 He bestowed his congratulations and his praise,
 As upon followers, who by their prowess had approved
 Themselves worthy of being called his fellow-warriors;
 And having received a wound in the defence of his country
 And her allies, according to the wish, which he had expressed
 Frequently and fervently,
 He closed his life gloriously in the field of honor
 On the 16th of January, 1808.

GEORGE,
 The Son of GEORGE the Third,
 Prince Regent of the United Kingdom of Great Britain
 And Ireland, and the Members of the Cabinet Council
 Commanded this Monument to be erected
 In the Year of our Lord 1814.

Inscription on the Monument of the Rev. Robert Parr.

Siste, Hospes;
 Moræ pretium est scire
 Cujus. huc conduntur cineres.
 ROBERTI PARR, A. M.
 Collegii Regalis apud Cantab. haud ita pridem Socii.
 Ecclesiarium postea de Horsted et Coltishall
 Rectoris quam dignissimi.
 Si vitam spectas, vixit quod docuit;
 Si fortunam, plura meruit quam tulit.
 Obiit magno parochiarum et amicorum luctu,
 Maximo conjugis et filiarum desiderio,
 Die octavo Septembris, A. D. 1759.

Ætatis 56.
 Hæc quicquid est monumentum
 In memoriam tam cari capitis
 Pia mœrensque conjux erexit

MARIA PARR.

Vale!

*Inscription on a piece of plate presented by Lord Chedworth to Dr. Parr
 written by the Rev. James Eyre.*

SAMUELI PARR, LL.D.
 Viro, ob ingenium peracre et perelegans,
 Eruditionem multiplicem et reconditam,
 Singularem Libertatis amorem,
 Et mentem simulationis omnino nesciam, eximio,
 Hocce summæ suæ observantiæ
 Et constantissimæ erga eum benevolentię monumentum
 JOHANNES BARO DE CHEDWORTH,
 Anno Sacro MDCCCIII.

Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1782. 133

(TRANSLATION.)

TO SAMUEL PARR, LL.D.
A man celebrated for an extraordinary acute and elegant genius,
Universal and profound erudition,
A distinguished love of Liberty,
A mind unconscious of deception,
JOHN BARON CHEDWORTH
Has dedicated this memorial,
In testimony of his high opinion
And uninterrupted regard.
A. D. 1803.

OXFORD LATIN PRIZE POEM, FOR 1782.

COLUMBUS.

TE, cui præclarum labentia sæcula nomen
Assensu tribuere uno, quem laudibus alti
Consilii patrem, et rerum, Columbe! novarum
Certatim decorat, meritisque Europa trophæis;
Te quoque Musa pio, quamvis circum horrida miscet
Prælia Iber, strepituque ciet stridente tumultus,
Prosequitur studio venerans; tibi gestit honores,
Immemor infestæ gentis, necdum invida famæ,
Ferre auctos, et parva lubens dare secta sepulcro.

Te duce, jam terrarum oras penetrare latentes
Oceanî veteris thalamos, atque ultima mundi
Regna datum; patuere agri, qua nulla priores
Ad portum advecti ngerunt carbasa nautæ;
Nam Libyæ objectis extremæ ubi sæangitur unda
Oris, et gremio solem longinqua cadentem
Excipit immensi tractu maris, hic Pater olim
Divisas penitus terras, ingentiaque arva
Seposuit procul, et vasto circum æquore vinxit.
Nil fecisset enim, mox pondere concita iniquo
Omnia, et incertis turbatus motibus orbis,
Quippe ruant, iterum dominantibus obruta tellus
Sedat aquis, dum monstra super phocæque natantes
Pro pecudum vitis, hominum pro gente vagentur.
Id metuens, æquis libratum lancibus orbem
Hinc atque hinc secuit Genitor, partesque locavit
Oppositas: hanc olim bello opibusque potentem
Europam, Nomadumque plagas, Eoæque regna;

Illam Atlantiacos immani mole premientem
 Fluctus ; illam adeo lato, volventibus annis,
 Insignem imperio, et fato meliore futuram.

Jamque explorati, repetitis cursibus, orbis
 Dimidium patuit ; jam navita littus, amica
 Fretus acu, spernit, victorque et noctis et Austri
 Alta petit maria, et pelago spatiatur aperto.
 Quid tibi Phœnicum classem, Hannonisque meatus
 Aut Diam¹ ignoti primo salis æquora rastro
 Expertum, referam ? meliore, en ! sidere natus
 Alter adest, majorque viri se attollit imago.
 Hunc rivalis honos, laudumque immensa cupido,
 Et positi sub sole novo spes credita mundi,
 Accendit, quem inter fluctus nimbosque sequaces
 Eductum, varias artes usumque profundi
 Nereides primum ante alios docuere magistræ.
 Ille tamen fastusque graves, turpemque repulsam,
 Septem hyemes supplex, alienis finibus errans,
 Passus, multa dolens animo, ne pectoris ingens
 Consilium caderet, virtusque periret inanis.

Jam vero rerum lucet felicior ordo.
 Fœmina, dux facti, famæ præsaga futura,
 Ipsa Isabella viros acuit, promptisque benigna
 Præsidii urget. Video per littus Iberum
 Instare arduos, tandemque vocantibus auris,
 Per mare tardatam nimium procedere classem.
 Vade ! age ! grande decus sæcli ! te prospera jussit
 Religio te certa animi, conscendere fluctus
 Auguria, et nullis virtus cessurâ periculis.

Tres illum perhibent totos longo ordine menses
 Per maris Occidui spatia atque inamabile marmor
 Rumpere iter, dum tristis hyemis insuetaque cœli
 Exagitat rabies, cum jam spes perdita terrar,
 Et socii increpitant ægrum, tamèn ipse minarum
 Atque operis patiens cursum tenet, ipse labores
 Perferre ingentes gaudet, proramque per altum
 Clavo hærens regere et ponto invigilare tument,
 Fata trahunt, atque ipsa augur fiducia lævis
 Ominibus major : tandem discrimine acerbo
 Dum gemit, et mediis vehitur vix pinus in undis,
 Ecce ! præcū tandem ignotæ telluris imago,
 Visa per obscuram noctem, spes suscitât ægras !
 Advertunt proras, fremit omnis nauta, solumque
 Præcipit exoptatum animo, terræque propinquæ

Obtutu immoritur, spirantemque aëra captat.
Ipse heros primus, telis insignis et ostro,
Ipse, reus votorum, ausi mirabilis auctor,
Exsilit in litus; socii simul agmine denso
Corripiunt ripas amplexi, atque oscula figunt.

Hæc adeo parva inventi primordia mundi
Cepere oceanum lassum : jacet insula¹ ponti
Exiguo tractu, salva rate nomina ducit,
Inde inter socias non despicienda Bahamas;
Cedit terra viris; quid enim certasse sub armis
Contra fata deum, contra ipsa Typhoea tela
Profuerit, quos nondum acies Bellona cruentas
Dirigere edocuit, castrisque exercita vita?
Illos blanda quies, illos blando ubere nutrit
Æternum veris gremium, dum mollior æther
Mulcet, odoratumque nemus, solesque propinqui.
Scilicet his rerum nulla experientia, nulla
Vis animi; classis trepide mirantur Iberæ
Extantes malos ventisque tumentia vela.
Ipsos quinetiam, delapsos nubibus, altos
Credunt advenisse deos, seu forte volanti
Vectus equo rutilis horret novus hospes in armis
Attonitos quatiens animos, seu sæpe nigrantes
Cum sonitu nimbos simulataque fulmina miscet.
Ergo sacro passim supplex veneratus honore,
Indigena ignotas herbas insuetaque sarta
Affert, atque novi fragrantia munera mali,
Inscius, et rudibus compellat numina votis.

Jamque iterum Zephyrus felici a littore classem
Æquatæque ferunt auræ, juvat astra retrorsum
Servata, et patriam carasque revisere sedes.
At non securos rerum, immunesque pericli.
Tendere iter fas est, iterum niger urget ab alto
Montanos fluctus insanaque murmura volvens
Nimbus, et adverso strident aquilone procellæ.
Quis tibi tum misero suspendit pectora sensus,
Heu! quantus, Columbe! pavor, discrimina sæva
Cernenti, ne jam iratis moriaris in undis,
Infelix operum victor, simul ipsa trophæa
Irrita, et ingentis pereant vestigia facti : ..
Non vero tantos nequicquam obiisse labores

Fata volunt. Tagus hospitio te dives amico
Excipit, et patrias tutum dimittit ad oras.

Undique fama volat, trepidoque Hispania fervet
Visendi studio: quæ te, Regina, movebant
Gaudia, gratantem reduces, quos ipsa per æquor
Egisti, auxilio et præsentî numine firmans?

Quid memorem quali vultu es mirata canentem
Monstra maris, cœlique minas, molemque laborum?
Quid cum parta nova ostentat regione trophæa
Insolitasque hominum formas, terræque repertæ
Primitias, aurique nimis venerabile donum?

Scilicet has certè laudēs, hæc præmia cœpti
Debita habes, heros! tarda jam tempora lauro
Velans, et longè quæsito exceptus honore.

Interea ciebris rursum stant æquora velis;
Ad portum gens tota ruit, tua numina in undas
Certa sequi, erroresque tuos. Nil tædia longi
Exterrent pelagi, quos sero accensa morantes
Increpitat virtus, prædæque arrecta cupido:
Tollere vela iterum, validos incidere funes
Dux jubet; illum adeo majoribus æquora fati
Ulteriora vocant, ac rerum angustior ordo.
En! ubi centenis fluviorum fontibus agmen
Effundit, pelago volvens Oronoco sonanti,
Mille per immanes populos, sensere ruentem
Littora, et ex imo gemitum pater edidit amne.
Illum allabentem jam hunc pavet excita tellus
Guianæ; attonitæ motu, et qua cæditur atrum
Honduræ nēmus, aut series ubi Mexico rerum
Artifici filo, plumaque interprete pingit,
Usque ad Amazonidum ripas Platæque fluenta
Undique conveniunt gentes, quas nuncia late
Fama ciet: rapto celerans subit efferus arcu
Quem cursu assiduo gaudentem, et cæde ferina
Cumana exercet sylvis, quēmq̃ue ardua propter
Littora piscosis pascit Nicaragua stagnis
Maxima, semesoque recens Caribæus ab hoste.
Esse etenim in fatiis, sic multos fama per annos
Tradiderat, fore longinquis e sedibus olim
Qui bello obstantes populos invitaque regna
Vinceret, et patrios premeret sub calce Penates.
Illum adeo auguriis, quem nunc nova tela ferentem
Externosque vident habitus, illum sibi regem
Portendi metuunt. Illi contraria demens

Arma parat, clavamque rapit, vibratque sagittas
Incola, et insolita formidine sævior instat.
Quid referam, quoties plumbi exitiale volantis
Pondus, sulphureoque furentes impete flammæ
Barbarus extimuit? vel quum densa agmina ducens
Conseruit trepidas mutato numine pugnas
Fortior, Hispanaque infecit clade Belerum?

At ne pulsæ acies retro crudeliaque astra
Dejiciant animos, quanquam te quicquid amari
Sors habet, infractæque rates, morbique, famesque
Et virtus mercede carens, et frigida regis
Destra, pater! cruciat, viden' ut novus ordo nepotum,
Par ingressus iter, surgat, qui tollere nomen
Possit humo, et famam fatis efferre jacentem!
Aspice, quam late variis Europa triumphis
Ferveat! Hinc victor tranat Vespusius altum
Plus æquo felix, illinc micat acer in armis
Cui patrios fines, sceptrumque coactus avitum
Montezuma dabit; nec tu, Peruvia! bello
Longe impar, stabis, quam nil arma ærea contra
Sol auctor gentis, nihil auri prodiga tellus,
Javerit; ecce etiam peregrina e sede profecta
Æmula gens Britonum zonas tentare nivales
Extremasque erit ausa plagas, ubi barbarus olim
Dediscet sævos mores, informiaque ora
Exuet, et divûm squallentia numina franget.

Fortunata nimis Britonum gens, si modo regna
Parta fovere sinu, pacisque imponere leges,
Fata sinant, justoque amplecti fœdere natos!

Hæc adeo, hæc tandem duræ solatia sortis
Accipies, magnoque animum oblectabis honore,
Optime dux! nam quid robur celeresque sagittas
Herculis, aut Bacchum spoliis curruque superbum,
Cladem Asiæ pestemque, moror? te sauctius ornât
Molitum meliora decus. Te maxima tellus,
Docta artes pulchras, fœdisque erepta tenebris
Virtute auspiciisque tuis, patremque bonique
Suspicit auctorem. His saltem lætabere donis
Scilicet; hæc manes descendet fama sub imos!

— JAMES,
COL. REGIN.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XLVI.

Emendation of a Passage in Æschylus.

SIR,

In the last No. of the *Classical Journal*, p. 185, a writer who signs himself T. proposes a correction of that famous line in the *Prometheus* where an anapæst occurs in the fourth foot. In the notes to my *Translation of the Agamemnon of Æschylus*, p. 18, I have proposed two emendations of the verse in question, and one of them is *exactly the same* as that now offered by your correspondent. In making the correction, I had my eye on a passage somewhat similar in *Homer*, but not on that which your correspondent has brought forward. My translation of the *Agamemnon* was published in January, 1824.

H. S. BOYD.

Hymnus Deo pro Græcorum salute, auct. P. H. MARRON.

Celse terrarum moderator orbis,
Supplicem serva populum precantis
Græciæ, et spreto, duce te, periclo
Eχime saluum.

Dira fac rumpât juga barbarorum,
Exuat sævæ tibi, Christe, gentis
Vincla, magnorum vigeat renascens
Gloria patrum.

ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΤΜΝΟΣ

Eis τὸν Μάρκον ΒΟΤΣΑΡΙΝ.

Ἕλληνες, κλαυσῶμεν ἄνδρα γενναῖον
Τὸν Μάρκον Βότσαριν ἥρωα νέον.
Οὗτος ἀπέθανεν ἡρωϊκῶς.

Τοῦτον τὸν ἥρωα ἄς μιμηθῶμεν
Ἄν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν μας ποθῶμεν
Καὶ θέλωμεν βλάψειν ἐχθρούς ἡμῶν.

Ἡρωα Βότσαρι, Ἡπείρου θαῦμα,
Εἰς ἡμᾶς ἄφησες μεγάλο τραῦμα.
Σῶμα σ' ἐχάσαμεν κι' ὄχι ἀρετάς.

ἴπαγ' ἀθάνατε, στοὺς οὐρανίους.
 Ἐπεὶ τῷ πλάστῃ μας τοὺς θείους ὕμνους,
 Καὶ δέου πάντοτε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

Τετράστιχον τοῦ . . .
 πρὸς Νικηταρᾶν τὸν στρατηγόν.

* Αλογον μὲ τὴν οὐρᾶ
 δῶρον τοῦ Νικηταρᾶ
 ἢ μοῦ στέλνε καὶ κριθάρι,
 ἢ τοῦ πέμπω τὸ τομάρι.

In our last No. (p. 274.) an error has inadvertently occurred, which we hasten to correct. Instead of the very classical copy of verses written by the learned and amiable Dr. Ramsden, on the occasion there specified, a Latin charade was inserted. The whole passage should have stood thus:—

Verses written in 1784 by the REV. DR. RAMSDEN, late deputy Regius Professor in the University of Cambridge, on being prevented from reading the grace in the Hall of Trinity College, on Trinity Sunday, (the then Commemoration day,) along with MR. BELL, the distinguished Chancery Barrister, on account of their personal appearance and uncouth dialect.

Unà ibant juvenes duo
 Ripam ad fluminem forte ; silentium
 Triste amicos tenet et dolor.
 Luctus causa eadem, culpa eadem ; Deus
 Non pleno dederat loqui
 Ore ; at lingua minus congrua gutturi
 Et tornata male invidet,
 Ne qua verba sonent sesquipedalia.
 Tum ut par flebile turturum,
 Alternò incipiunt cum gemitu. B. Scelus
 Quid feci in proprium harem,
 Ut me, tu juvenum sancte pater, vetes
 Pransuris benedicere ?
 R. Sprevisi quoque nos ; muneris at memor
 Flamen fidus eram tibi.
 B. At quamvis mihi vox barbara Vandali
 Et raucum sonui Gothum.

140 *On a New Mode of Pronouncing*

- R. Quamvis et statuâ sum taciturnior,
Et multum timeo loqui.
- B. Quamvis ore magis cardine dissona,
In qua janua vertitur.
- R. Quamvis me superat ventus, ut improbus
Per rimam tenuem strepit.
- B. Quamvis non superant Indica tympana
Incus pulsare malleo.
- R. Quamvis me superat pullus avis querens,
Nido si genetrix abest.
- B. Non flavens meruit dedecus hoc coma,
Aut gressus pedis impares.
- R. Nec nos hoc tulimus jure, quia in genis
Nostris gratia non nitet.
- B. At me Pythagoras seliget, ut suam
Æternamque silens bibam
Doctrinam ex liquido fonte Matheseos.
- R. At nobis lyra vox erit,
Dum corvi veluti, grex alius^c strepunt.

ON A NEW MODE OF PRONOUNCING THE ANCIENT LANGUAGES.

As the following article is one of the chapters of an unpublished work, it may be proper to set down shortly some of the leading principles of the work, and an^e explanation of some of the marks. Ancient accent the author considers as solely relating to the elevation and depression of the voice, and not to quantity: Modern, or at least English accent, he considers on the authority of Johnson, and of Foster, as simply relating to the length of syllables, and not to their elevation or depression in recitation; those syllables on which our accent is laid, being always (though not equally long) longer than those on which it is *not* laid. He gives in proof of it, the convertibility of the accentual and of the ancient marks: accented syllables corresponding with the long; *unaccented* with the short; both marks guiding to the same quantity and cadence. He considers the ictus metricus, with the arsis and thesis, as the ancient guide in recitation, and as incompatible with our mode; the ictus as a *stroke* or

^c. the choristers.

stress given, in hexameters, to the first syllable of every foot which must invariably be long. The pyrrhic has no standard in English, as we accent every dissyllable either on the first or on the last syllable; nor has it any in Greek or Latin, as we accent them in the same manner. A mark which he has placed under the last syllable of every pyrrhic [$_$] is of a negative kind; it is intended to warn the reader not to lay *any* accent on the first syllable, as that would check the progress, *ipso in limine*, of this rapid foot; and likewise to indicate that he is to give the slightest possible touch, and no more than is necessary for articulation, to the last: and, if he passes quickly over the one to the other, and quits the last almost as soon as he has touched on it, he will give to the whole that peculiar lightness, the true characteristic of the pyrrhic, which distinguishes it from the other ancient dissyllabic feet, and of which, the author believes, there is scarcely an example in any modern language. As he wishes to show the effect of our accent, he has placed *above* the line, the accentual mark over every syllable on which we lay it; and has also placed the ancient mark of long over the *same* syllable, whether *really* long or short in the verse: and with the same proviso, the mark of short over every *unaccented* syllable. *Below* the line he has placed a stroke [-] as a mark of the ictus on the first of every foot in hexameters; and the pyrrhic mark [$_$], wherever a pyrrhic occurs, *under* the last syllable. He considers it as absolutely necessary to omit the elided syllables in pronouncing the Latin as we do in pronouncing the Greek, as otherwise there can be no metre wherever they occur: every elided syllable, if pronounced, is redundant: there are often two or more in the same line; and it is obvious that there can be no metre with even a single one.

"In a former part of this Essay I have slightly mentioned a mode of pronouncing the iambus and the pyrrhic, originally, I believe, introduced at the Charter House, which has of late years very much prevailed. The old mode (according to which I have hitherto marked those feet above the line) is to place the accent immediately after the vowel, as *me'ya* and *ma'gis*, equally so whether they were iambs or pyrrhics: the new mode, to place it after the consonant, as *me'ya* and *mag'is*, to pronounce them as we should if written *me'yy'a* and *magg'is*, in which way I shall write them in this particular discussion. The ground of this alteration is, that *me'ya* and *ma'gis* are positive trochees, that the first syllable is evidently long, and that it ought to be made short in pronunciation; than which nothing can be more just; the question,

¹ Essay on the Modern Pronunciation of the Greek and Latin Languages.

however, is, whether the alteration be an effectual remedy, or indeed any remedy at all. I trust it has been satisfactorily shown in the early part of these pages, that our accent uniformly gives length to the accented syllable, the unaccented being uniformly short; consequently that all dissyllables accented on the first must be trochees; when after the vowel perfect, when after the consonant imperfect, but still trochees. I have also shown, what indeed is most evident, that we have a number of iambs in English perfect standards for the quantity and cadence of that foot in Latin, though we never make use of them for that purpose, pronouncing the Latin word *āgō*, not like our English word *āgō*, and this universally throughout that language. In the Greek we give to some dissyllables (contracted by elision from trisyllables) what I consider as the true quantity and cadence of the iambus, as *γυναικ'*, *πειρ'*, accenting them on the final; are they considered in the same light by the advocates of this system? If the answer be in the affirmative, then they are acknowledged standards for the pronunciation of that foot, and there can be only one standard; yet in the same line, a word equally an iambus from the structure of the verse, is pronounced in the new way *βελλος*: both cannot be right; and therefore they should consistently either change their pronunciation of the first to *αυταρ ἐπ'εῖρ' αυτοισι*, or that of the second to *βέλως εχεπευκες επιεις*. There can scarcely be a doubt that this last mode should be adopted in this and in all cases, as invariably agreeing in metre and rhythm with the few but exact standards in Greek, and the numerous undeniable standards in English, and as being in all cases consistent. Why then, it may be asked, when so simple, obvious, and consistent, a mode presented itself, was recourse had to a mode which already appears (and will appear more strongly) to be inconsistent with our occasional pronunciation of the iambus in Greek, and our constant pronunciation of it in English? Two causes may be assigned, closely connected with each other: the one, that there is no dissyllable in English really a pyrrhic, which in that case *would* have been, as so many iambs *are*, standards for pronunciation: the other, that a number of them are falsely considered as such, and as perfect standards for the quantity and sound of that foot in Greek and in Latin: on this very material point I shall offer some observations, in addition to those I have already made. All such words as *bod'y*, *berr'y*, *mon'ey*, &c. the accent being after the consonant, are, as I have ventured to assert, falsely considered as pyrrhics, and standards; their first syllable being supposed to be positively, not comparatively, short: such words, when a preceding syllable is added to them, often form a dactyl, as *somebody*, *nobody*, *strawberry*, &c. and it is evident that the two last syllables of a dactyl must be a pyrrhic; and no less so, that in all distinct dactyls we uniformly pronounce them as such, whether in

ancient or in modern languages : on these grounds the two last syllables of *somebody*, *strawberry*, &c. must be pyrrhics, must have the true sound and cadence of that foot, and be standards for its pronunciation. What is that sound? not that of *bod'y* or *berr'y*, but, as every one will perceive who first sounds the dactyls, and then the two last syllables as he did sound them, *bödý*, *bërrý*, just like *cölör* without the *dis*. *Discolor* is at once felt to be no dactyl; why? because our accent is on the second syllable; change it to the first, *discolor*, the dactyl is restored: in the same manner *somebod'y* is no dactyl, but an amphibrach; shift the accent, and the dactyl *sómebody* is restored. What is then the process by which the imperfect trochees *bod'y*, *berr'y*, &c. become pyrrhics? clearly by the accent being taken from them, which made their first syllable long, and by its being laid on the first of the compound *sómebody*, *stráwberry*; and our ancestors, when they formed those compounds, seem, by a sort of instinct, to have *felt*, though they might not *know*, that accent gave length: and thus to have reversed what Madame du Defand so ingeniously says of the Duchess of Choiseul, "Elle sait qu'elle m'aime, mais ne le sent pas." It may perhaps be said by the advocates for English pyrrhics; admitting that these dissyllables must be deprived of their accent before they can, as pyrrhics, form the ends of dactyls, still they are the only examples you have produced of such a conversion; can you give any of real acknowledged trochees so converted? In answer to the question, which is a very fair one, I shall propose the following examples, in all the different vowels, *Mary*, *rosemary*; *keeper*, *gamekeeper*; *finite*, *infinite*; *holder*, *Stadtholder*; *jury*, *perjury*. There is at least one instance of an *iambus* being converted by the same process, as from *belów*, *fúrbelow*: restore the accent to the iambus, keeping that on the first syllable, the dactyl becomes an amphimacer, the pyrrhic an iambus, *fúrbelów*. It is thus used in an old catch for the sake of the rhythm, and of the waggery,

Adam cātch'd Eve by the fúrbelów,
And that's the oldest catch I know.

I have mentioned the want of any dissyllabic standard for the pyrrhic as a principal cause of the false pronunciation of the iambus; yet it seems strange, that *because* we have no standard for the one, we should *therefore* make no use of the numerous and perfect standards for the other: the fact is, that there was a real difficulty and embarrassment respecting the new-fangled pyrrhic, as connected with the new-fangled iambus; thus, for instance, when in our usual method we pronounce the iambus *māri*, and the pyrrhic *mār'ē*, as trochees, both, though equally false quantities, keep each other in countenance; and so in the new way, though likewise false quantities, do *marr'i* and *marr'e*: but if any one were to pronounce the iambus with an accent on the last syllable, as it evidently ought to be pronounced, and the pyrrhic with it

on the first, there could be no doubt that one of them must be wrong, and as little which of them; especially if both the words occurred on the same line; as in

Nam Venus orta mari tutum mare præstat eunti.

Who, after the hearing the first syllable of *mari* so decidedly short,—so exactly of the same cadence with *deny*, *rely*, could endure *marr'i* as an iambus? whoever could, might very well endure *denn'y* and *rell'y* in English. Had there been any English dissyllables possessing as decidedly and convincingly the quantity, cadence, and true character of the pyrrhic as those I have mentioned present of the iambus, perhaps in regard to those two feet at least the rule might have been dispensed with; and possibly, from the manifest advantage of such a change in a part of the system, similar changes might have been made in other parts, till the whole of it was abandoned. One glaring vice of this new mode is its inconsistency; for, admitting that by placing the accent after the consonant, *magg'is* became a true pyrrhic, and both its syllables equally short, what happens when in the same verse it is first a pyrrhic and then an iambus? as in

Et magis atque magis.

I understand that in both places they are pronounced exactly alike; and on this ground I would ask (not caring what the answer might be), is *gis* long or short? if long, there can be no pyrrhic; if short, no iambus; and it cannot be both long and short. Again, admitting what is obviously inadmissible, that by changing *magis* into *magg'is*, a true pyrrhic, and likewise a true iambus, are acquired, what is to be done where the vowel is followed by another, as in *meus*? there is no remedy, unless the rule be given up, which can never be expected from an advocate for the old system, as well as for the new mode; they therefore are reduced to the mortifying disgrace of pronouncing *mēus*, *tīus*, &c. like the common herd, and to make them, knowingly, positive trochees. This, though mortifying, was unavoidable; but where a *u* is followed by a consonant, as in *rupi*, *furor*, &c. the new mode might be, according to their own principles, and ought to have been made use of; they, however, have chosen to retain the old pronunciation, and their practice is clearly at variance with their principle. The principle is, that the vowel is to be passed over in pyrrhics and iambs wherever this can be done; it cannot in *rupi*, but may, and ought consistently, to be done in *rupē*, the first syllable of which would then be pronounced like the first of *cunn'ing*; that of *con'ey* (a striking specimen of the difference between our spelling and our speaking) has the same sound, and the whole word—with as good a claim to be a pyrrhic as any other trochee—exactly that of *rup'e* or *rup'ē*. Why then against the principle and the general practice in consequence of it is the old pronunciation retained? I know

not; having merely heard the fact from a person bred at the Charter House, but no cause was assigned. It may perhaps have been observed, that in *κύνε* the sound of the *u* as *we* sound the vowel is preserved; whereas in *κυν'ε* or *κυνν'ε*, as in *cunn'ing* or *pun'ish*, it is lost, and in lieu of it something very like the French *e muet* is substituted; for *que n'i* would indicate to a Frenchman the sound of *coney* as nearly as the different accents and habits of the two languages would admit of; and is, indeed, the way in which he would pronounce the word. This change of the sound is certainly a very mischievous consequence of the change in the placing of the accent; and he who first introduced it may, in this case, have retained the old pronunciation of *κύνε*, though so positive a trochee, "*majoris fugiens opprobria culpæ.*" But although in respect to the *u*, the greater sin, or at least one of two sins, be avoided, it is not in other vowels: I imagine that the first syllable of *κορρ'ον* has, in the new mode, the sound of *for* or of *cor* in Latin; if so, then the true sound of the *o* is as completely gone as that of the *u* in *κυνν'ε*. The *ο* of *κορρ'ον* and of *morrow* are alike; not an *o*, but a short *au*: lengthen *morr'ow*, you have *mau'ro*; shorten *mau'ro*, you have *morrow*; in the same manner lengthen *κορρ'ον*, you have, in English characters, *caur-yoon*; shorten it, and you return to *κορρ'ον*. The sounds of the *a* and the *e* are likewise often changed by the new mode, though less offensively. Another consequence of passing over the *u* to the consonant may have had some little influence; that of its often producing a ludicrous similarity to English words, as in the one just mentioned of *coney*; *sup'er* becomes *supp'er*; *Cur'ius*, *curry us*, &c. This however would scarcely be worth thinking of, if it did not add to a number of others also derived from the new mode: *décus*, *Márius*, *dámus*, are changed to *deck us*, *marry us*, *damn us*: and *σίχη*, *φίλη*, *σίλε*, to *sticky*, *filly*, *silly*. Again, *βέλη* becomes *belly*, *γάμον* *gammon*, *πάτι* *potty*, *céler* *cellar*: and there is a very appropriate epithet to a gay damsel at a supper mentioned by Horace, "*Damalis merr'i.*" Swift, in his ludicrous etymologies, has supposed the name of Hector's wife to have been given to her from that of her father, Andrew Mackay, a well-known Scotch pedlar; the old pronunciation did not at all suit it; the new one as exactly as Swift could have wished; and, with this surname of *Μαχχ'η*, furnishes a crowd of Christian names; *dóle*, *φάρη*, *sále*, *gérc*, *τόμη*, *roger*, *δικη*, are at once changed to *Dolly*, *Fanny*, *Sally*, *Jerry*, *Tommy*, *Roger*, and *Dicky*. This last familiar diminutive ill accords with the august person of Justice:

ἡ συνοδικὸς τῶν κατὰ θεὸν δικη.

In this line our trochaic propensity is peculiarly unlucky; three successive trochees at the end of an iambic, and such trochees!

One of the first things that strikes us in the change from the old

146 *On a New Mode of Pronouncing*

pronunciation of the pyrrhic and iambus, is the ambiguities it gives rise to: *erat* becomes *errat*; as in

Hoc erat in votis; moddus agri non itta magnus,

and

Non formosus errat, sed erat facundus Ulysses.

Térés, an epithet applied to beauty, even to the neck of Venus, is changed to *terr'es*. Penelope, in Ovid's Epistle, is afraid lest Ulysses at his return should think her changed from a girl, not (as we are now taught to pronounce the word) into an old woman, but into a year:

Facta videbor annus:

and Horace tells Lyce that she is growing into one:

*Vis annus et tamen.*¹

These ambiguities, it will be said, have been guarded against: *erat* and *anus*, as every body once called them, are by the new mode to have the sound we used to give to *errat* and *annus*; but we are taught by the same mode to pronounce the *real* trochees as the Italians do, *er'rat* and *an'nus*, carefully separating each consonant. This certainly does form a distinction; it is one, however, that requires great attention to the sounds, both in the speaker and the hearer, and which would be quite unnecessary, were the evidently true sound given to the iambus, and the no less certainly true one to the pyrrhic, as being founded on our own pronunciation of that foot, though somewhat in disguise. The Italian mode of pronouncing *er'rat*, *an'nus*, &c. I could wish to be universally adopted; and we should have a real obligation to the Charter House for having introduced and practised that mode,² were it not connected with the unjustifiable one of *err'at* and *ann'us*; the strongest objection to which is, that it does not in the smallest degree answer the proposed object. This will at once be seen, and in the most striking manner, by means of a line already quoted: in the old mode,

Νῦσσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσέ κἀκὴν,

¹ An old housekeeper at Kensington Palace used to make a metamorphosis of a similar kind: on showing a picture of Perseus and Andromeda, she always said, "Ladies and gentlemen, there is Anno Domini chained to the rock."

² Another part of the Charter House mode of pronouncing ought by no means to be omitted: it is, that when a long vowel precedes a single consonant, as *é-ruet*, *ó-mine*, &c. they dwell on the vowel instead of passing over it to the consonant, as is generally done, as *er'uet*, *om'ine*. This is a most decided improvement, and one that, together with the detached Italian utterance of *er-rat*, *an-nus*, &c. will I hope be universally adopted.

is the flattest prose : is it less so when in the new mode we say,

Νούσον ἀνν'α στραττ'όν ᾠ'ρσ'ε κᾶκκ'ήν.

Is it not evident, that no slight degree of harshness and cacophony is added, while the false quantities and the trochaic cadence are preserved? and equally evident, that by restoring the genuine sound and cadence of the pyrrhic and the iambi, those of the verse altogether are as fine as in any verse in the poem :

Νουσον ανα στρατον ὠρσε κακην, υλεκοντο δε λαοι.

Were no other verse quoted, nothing more said on the subject, this single example would, in my opinion, be a clear condemnation both of the general system and of the partial change ; I shall, however, produce other quotations of various kinds, all tending to show, that the metre and rhythm are no less spoiled by the new than by the old mode, and the sound much more. In the following line, every thing quite to the end is disfigured :

Ῥέχθε'ντος κᾶκκ'ού ἔστ' ἀκκ'ος ὕρε'ν' ἀλλ'ᾶ πολλ'ᾶν πρί'ν.

In the beginning of the line I am going to quote, a most ludicrous jingle is made by the new mode, followed by an uncouth word ; neither of which appeared in the old mode :

Ἀλλ'ᾶ μάλλ'ᾶ στίχχ'ᾶς ἱμ'ῖ διᾶ' μπερῆς :

I have in a former part given various instances of the extreme injury done to rapidity by the old mode of pronouncing the iambus followed by the pyrrhic : is less injury done to it by the new one in *παρ'ος κοιν'ν*, *μαλλ'ᾶ σχεδδ'ον*, *χραμμ'αι θορρ'ε*? or by

Ἰλέ voll'at, simm'ul a'vā fū'gā, simm'ul aē'quōiā vē'rrens?

But admitting that *voll'at*, *simm'ul*, &c. are all that their warmest advocates suppose them to be, the change would be hardly worth making, unless it were complete : in the midst of them we here see the avowed trochee, *fūgh* ; and in the verse I am going to quote there is an iambus and two pyrrhics of that kind :

Hēu fū'gē nā'tē dē'ā tē'quē hīs ā'it ē'ripē flammie.¹

¹ In all the verses hitherto quoted, the pyrrhic, I believe, ought to be joined to the preceding long syllable, and to form the end of a dactyl, as "*Hēu fūgē, hīs āit*:" but in the next verse,

Hostis libet muros ; ruit alto a culmine Troja,

the sense requires that it should be joined to the subsequent long syllable, *ruit alt'*, and form in pronunciation an anapaest : it is still more strongly required in
cur hoc?

Dicam si potero, male ver'm examinat omnis.

148 On a New Mode of Pronouncing

There is a line (already mentioned for a different purpose) in the animated description of the Phalanx, where the iambus followed by the pyrrhic, when both are rightly pronounced, gives a striking dactylic impetus to the rhythm ;

Ἀσπίς ἀρ' ἀσπίδ' ἐρείδε, κορυς κορυν, ἀνερά δ' ἀνῆρ.¹

On the other hand, in our usual way, the verse, after a triumphant beginning, falters, and almost stops in the middle, where it should firmly and rapidly advance ;

Ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἐρείδε, -κόρυς κόρυι, -ἀνέρα δ' ἀνῆρ.

In the new mode, to parody a distich in Churchill's *Rosciad* ;

When the swift Dactyl's in its full career,
How vilely κορυς κορυν grates the ear !

I shall next give an example of the same two feet employed in the same part of the verse, but with a very different sort of expression ; it is from Virgil's third Eclogue. I shall put down the preceding line, partly for the sake of connexion, but more for that of showing how quickly and lightly the rhythm goes off, when the elided syllables are omitted ; how heavily it drags, when they are distinctly pronounced, and the quantity disregarded. I shall first give the lines as in all probability they were, then as, in the new mode, they are, pronounced :

Phyllid' am' ant' alias, nam me decedere flevit,

Et longum formosē vale, vale, inquit, Iola.

Phyll'ida' am'm'ō āntō all'ias, nām mē' dēce'dēce flē'vit,
Ēt lō'ngūm fōrmō'sē vāll'ē, vāll'ē, īnquīt, Iō'la.

Metre absolutely requires, and rhythm in a great degree, that the two syllables of every spondee should be long, and equally long, no less in recitation than in structure ; but to make such a spondee as *lōngūm* a trochee, is at once to sin against metre, rhythm, and expression : instead of shortening the syllable, we ought, as guided by the ictus, not only to give it length, but stress : this, however,

"Dicam si potero male" would be a ridiculous *contresens*. It sometimes happens that a pyrrhic should be pronounced distinctly by itself, as

Rettuleris pannum ;—refer—et sine vivat ineptus :

but the strongest instance is in Anna's speech, when she sees Dido expiring .

Extincti me teque soror, populūque, patresque
Silonios, urbemque tuam . dātē, vulnera lymphis
Abluam.

The sense is, "Date lymphas, ut illis abluam vulnera," but the omission strikingly expresses hurry and agitation : it is obvious that we could neither say "tuam date," nor "date vulnera."

¹ Iliad xiii. 131.

though I did not like to pass over it, is not to my present purpose: the iambus and pyrrhic are, and very strikingly. When the last syllable of the iambus has its due length and stress, and is uttered in rather a full and high tone, and when we appear to linger on it, and then connect and blend it with the pyrrhic nearly as one word—*vale-vale*—the last farewell, being breathed out in a weaker and lower tone, seems a faint echo of the first; and, in my mind, is very happily suited to the expression. I cannot perceive in what way the pronunciation of *vale*, *vale*, could be altered, so as to be more exactly suited to the quantity, cadence, and genuine character of the two feet, whether single or joined together; *va'le*, *va'le*, are avowedly trochees, and perfect; *vale*, *vale*, are also, though not avowedly, trochees, but imperfect: both, therefore, are equally at variance with the metre and the rhythm. We had always been taught to lay the accent after the vowel; we are now taught to lay it after the consonant: in either way, the sound being the very same, there can be no sort of distinction between the two feet! can this ever be right, between any two feet? The cadence too, in the new mode, is that which had uniformly been given to *vall'e*,

Hic in reducta valle Caniculae.

The trochee, as we pronounce it, has a short accent; but we do not (a distinction which should never be lost sight of) make a *false*, but an *imperfect* quantity: now if it be true that the first syllable of *vale* or *vall'e* (for the sound is the same) is really short, and that such a passing over of the vowel is the proper method of giving shortness, we ought consistently to say *cani'culæ*, a ditrochee, answering precisely to *vall'e vall'e*; while *cani'culæ*, no less precisely, answers to *vale-vale*.

There is a line in the sixth Eclogue, where the idea of an echo, the iambus and pyrrhic being in the same position, is more immediately and forcibly suggested by the subject;

His adjungit Hylas nautæ quo fonte relictum
Clamassent, ut litus Hyla-Hyla omne sonaret.

We may apply to this verse the same sort of comparison as to the other; "*litus Hyla-Hyla*" answers to "*condis amabile*"; "*littus Hyl'la Hyl'la*" to "*condis amn'abile*."

I shall lastly give an example of an hexameter and pentameter. They are the two concluding lines of an epigram on a beautiful female musician, from whose various charms and attractions there was no escaping. I shall put down the two preceding lines, but in them shall only mark the *right* quantities.

Ποι σὲ φιλῶ; παντὶ με περιστάχουσιν ἑρῶτες·

Ὅδ' ὅσον ἀπνευσταί βιον ἔωσι χρονον·

150 *On Pronouncing Ancient Languages.*

Ἡ γὰρ μοι μορφή βαλλεῖ ποθόν, ἡ παλὶ μουσα,
Ἡ χαρὶς, ἡ—τι λεγώ; πάντα πυρὶ φλεγομαι.

Many things in these lines will strike the attentive reader, judging only from the marks, and their evident effect : first, the variety given to the words themselves, and to the whole rhythm, by the intermixture of long and short finals : secondly, the connexion that is produced by means of the long ones : thirdly, the perfect dactyls which are formed by means of the pyrrhics, when they have their true cadence, and the preceding syllables their due length. All this will strike him much more strongly when he compares the last distich and its marks with the same distich as I shall now mark it :

Ἡ' γὰρ μοι μὀρφή βαλλ'λεῖ ποθ'όν, ἡ παλλ'ι μούσα,
Ἡ χαρ'ρίς, ἡ—τι λεγγ'ώ; π'άντ'α πυρὶ φλε' γόμαϊ.

In these two lines, as they are marked, there is not a vestige of metre or rhythm from beginning to end : there is neither spondee nor dactyl, unless it be the reversed anapaest, φλιγγμαί, which will hardly be claimed ; and, to my ear, the frequent recurrence of the sound of a consonant in the first syllable, as ποθόν, παλλι, χαρρις, λεγγω, is at once both harsh and monotonous, and, to my judgment, equally destructive both of metre and rhythm.

We have been in the constant habit of applying our accent to the ancient languages, just as we use it in our own, and in so doing have been led into numberless errors of the grossest kind : accent, however, is not to blame, but only the mode of applying it : change the mode, and there cannot be a safer or more effectual guide. The manner of changing it is the simplest and easiest possible : instead of laying it on those syllables, whether long or short, upon which the Romans laid theirs, let it be laid on *every* long syllable, and never on any short one : the accented syllables would then, as in English, be long, the unaccented short. Were we to follow this plain rule, we could never make a false quantity ; it would be highly proper, however, in addition, to adopt the ancient guide of recitation, the ictus metricus, which would *then* always act in co-operation with accent, never in opposition to it ; the true sound of the pyrrhic should also be strictly attended to ; and, till our habits were settled, it might be well to use the different marks. This mode, and these marks, would insure the great essential points in recitation, those of quantity, metre, and of the genuine rhythm ; and with many others, as variety, euphony, connexion, and expression, with ease and distinctness of articulation.

PHILOLOGICAL EXTRACTS

From MR. E. H. BARKER'S *Letters on the Authorship of Junius's Letters*.

MR. E. H. BARKER has recently published a work intitled *The claims of Sir Philip Francis, K. B. to the Authorship of Junius's Letters disproved, &c.* and although our work is not a suitable place for discussing this question, yet, as the volume contains some matter, which may not be unacceptable to classical scholars, we cannot hesitate to extract it:—

Classical philologists are often called to decide on questions of authorship, involving many points similar to those which are involved in the case of Junius. Of the many instances, to which the Author might refer, he will content himself with one remarkable coincidence, in the words of his learned friend, Professor Anthon, of Columbia College, New York:—

"There has come down to us a *Dialogue* entitled *de Claris Oratoribus, sive de Causis corruptæ Eloquentiæ*. The Mss. and old editions name Tacitus as the author of this production; a great number of commentators, however, ascribe it to Quintilian, and some to Pliny the younger. They, who argue from the language of Mss., allege in their favor Pomponius Sabinus, a grammarian who states that Tacitus had given to the works of Mæcenas the epithet of *calamistri*. Now the passage, to which the grammarian alludes, is actually found in the 26th chapter of the *Dialogue* under consideration. The author of the *Dialogue*, moreover, informs us in the first chapter that he was a very young man, (*juvenis admodum*), when he wrote it, or, at least, at the period when he supposes it to have been held in his presence. This point of time is clearly determined in the 17th chapter; it was the 6th year of the reign of Vespasian, A. D. 75.* Tacitus at this period would be about 16 years of age. From what has been said, then, it will be perceived that, as far as chronology is concerned, nothing prevents our regarding Tacitus as the author of the *Dialogue* in question. It is true we find a marked difference between the style of the writer of this *Dialogue*, and that of the historian; but would not the intervening period of 40 years sufficiently account for this discrepancy, and the language of the *man* be different from the tone of *early youth*? Might not too the same writer, have varied his style in order to adapt it to different subjects? Ought he not to assimilate his style to the various characters, who bear a part in the *Dialogue*? Induced by these and other reasons, Pignon, Dodwell, Schulze, and many others have given their opinion in favor of our adhering to the titles of the Mss., and have ascribed the *Dialogue* to Tacitus. Rhenanus was the first, who entertained doubts respecting the claim of Tacitus to the authorship of this production, and since his time Dousa, Stephens, Freinsheims, and others no less celebrated, have contended that Quintilian, not Tacitus, must be regarded as the true writer of the work. They place great reliance on two passages of Quintilian, where that writer says expressly

that he had composed a separate treatise on the *Causes of the Corruption of Eloquence*, (*Inst. Or.* vi, 8, 6.) as well as on many other passages, in which this same work is cited, without the author's indicating the title. How can we suppose, it is asked, that either Tacitus or Pliny would be inclined to treat of a subject, which had already been discussed by Quintilian? These same critics observe, moreover, that there appears to be a great analogy, not only between the matter treated of in this *Dialogue*, and those which form the subject of Quintilian's writings, but also between his style and that of the work in question. But it may be replied, in the first place, that at the time, when the *Dialogue* was written, Quintilian was already 33 years of age, a period of life to which the expression *juvenis admodum* can with no propriety whatever be made to apply. In the next place, the argument deduced from analogy of style is not the most conclusive, since those critics, who assign the work to Pliny or Tacitus, adduce a similar argument, in support of their claims. On the other hand, the argument which has been drawn from identity of title, would be a very strong one, if it were not a fact that the second title, which is found in modern editions, *de Causis corruptæ Eloquentiæ*, owes its existence entirely to Lipsius, who thought fit to add this second title, which he had found in Quintilian. All the Mss. and the early editions merely have the title *de clavis Oratoribus*, or else this one, *Dialogus an sui Sæculi Oratores et quare concedant*. Another circumstance very much against the idea of Quintilian's being the author of the piece, is the fact of his more than once referring the reader to his other work for matters, of which the *Dialogue* we are considering makes not the slightest mention; such, for example, are the *hyperbole* and *exaggeration*, of which he speaks in the 3rd bk. ch. 3. and 6. The latest editor of Quintilian, Spalding, has carefully collected all these passages, which, in his opinion, show that Quintilian was not the author of the *Dialogue*.—*Professor Anthon's Edition of Lempriere's Classical Dictionary*, p. 800. edn. Barker.

1. The reader will observe that those critics, who assign the work to Pliny or Tacitus, adduce, in support of their claims, the same course of argument, from analogy of style, which other critics employ for adjudicating the composition to Quintilian;—i. e. Mr. Taylor contends for the claims of Sir Philip Francis by the same line of argument as that which is pursued by Mr. Roche in support of the claims of Burke?

2. The words *admodum juvenis*, which Professor Anthon thinks cannot be with propriety applied to Quintilian, who was then 33 years of age, certainly may, with strict propriety, note that period of life. According to the most correct Roman writers, human life was divided into 4 stages of 15 years each: thus *pueritia* was within 15; *adolescencia* within 30; *juventus* within 45; and *senectus* comprised the remaining period of life. Of this division the author has given some curious examples in the *Classical Journal*, T. i. p. 473.

To this division Tacitus alludes, *Agr.* 3. "Quid, si, pcr̄ quindecim annos," &c. Censorinus de *Die Natali*, xiv. p. 74. Lindeabr. :—"Igitur, expositis iis," &c.

One other extract from Professor Anthon's additions to *Dr. Lempriere's Classical Dictionary* will not be unacceptable to the reader:—"It has been said above that the *Lives* of Nepos were published in his own name by *Amulius Probus*. In the *Dedication* of this latter writer, which is in bad Latin verse, no mention whatever is made of Nepos,

and Probus claims the work as the joint production of himself, his father, and grandfather. One is astonished at the want of intelligence on the part of his readers, in their not perceiving the discrepancy between the thoughts and sentiments which prevailed in the age of Nepos, and those which characterised the reign of Theodosius; nor in being struck with the difference between the barbarous style of the writers who flourished in the latter period, and the elegance of the golden age, which marks the diction of the historian. It must be confessed, however, that the style of the *Life of Atticus*, which the Mss. unanimously ascribe to Nepos, while they all agree in naming Æmilius Probus as the author of the *Lives of Illustrious Commanders*, differs essentially from that of the last mentioned work, in which may be observed various unusual expressions, singular constructions, and some solecisms, which may well excite surprise, if regarded as coming from a contemporary of Cicero. It seems most reasonable to adopt the conjecture of Barth, that Probus treated the work of Nepos as Justin did that of Trogus Pompeius, in making changes, additions, and retrenchments throughout. This hypothesis acquires additional weight from what Nepos himself observes, towards the conclusion of his *Preface*, respecting the *large size* of the volume, which he was giving to the world."—*Preface*.

V. "Junius's Letters," says Mr. Taylor, p. 161. "abound with classical allusions and quotations, and he seems in no respect deficient in scholastic attainments. Of a character perfectly similar, Sir Philip Francis is an acknowledged scholar, without having studied at either University. There is in all his writings a frequent and happy reference to the Greek and Roman authors, but especially to the latter; and in Horace he has proved himself a very sound and ingenious critic. To the tuition of so profound and elegant scholar as Dr. Francis is, may be ascribed this familiarity with the works of the ancients: and the advantages afforded him in this respect, would amply supply, if they did not surpass, those which are usually met with in a college-education." Mr. Taylor has somewhat overcharged his statement respecting the critical remarks of Sir Philip Francis on Horace. The reader shall decide between us.

The remarks alluded to occur in the following book:—"A Poetical Translation of the Works of Horace, with the Original Text, and Critical Notes collected from his best Latin and French Commentators. By Philip Francis, D. D. A new Edition, with additional Notes by Edward Du Bois Esq. of the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple." In 4 vols. Lond. 1807. 12mo. The editor furnishes us with the following information in his preface:—"Of his son, Sir Philip Francis, it is now my business to speak; and here the obligation I owe him, and the esteem with which his kindness has inspired me, would seem to prescribe that I should expatiate on a theme so grateful; but as in the preceding instance, so in this, the hour is past. His public services, his erudition, genius, and acquirements, need no panegyric from me to make them known. They are known already: and it becomes me better to quit this ample field, and bring my contracted views to bear directly on the object before us. The humble office imposed upon me was merely to correct a copy of the most approved edition of Dr. Francis's Horace; and desirous of some information on the subject, I took the liberty of waiting on Sir Philip Francis, who not only courteously instructed me in every thing that I wished to know, but sup-

plied me, after several intrusions on his time, with three very ingenious notes, which enrich the following pages. They will be found with the date 1806, at 1,304. 3,32. 4,312. It will be perceived that the two former remarks prefer a construction differing from that put on them by Dr. Francis; which offers a striking proof of a mind unsusceptible of every disingenuous bias in the pursuit of truth. The first of these comments, *Od. ii. 20. 6.* is particularly deserving of attention, since the passage has puzzled all the annotators; who, after turning *quem vocas* as it would bear, and as it would not bear, and even unwarrantably altering the text, were at last compelled to leave the sense at least as doubtful as ever, and it remained for Sir Philip Francis to be the means of preserving a light, which had never beamed on them.

2. "The first mentioned note is on *Od. ii. 20, 6.*

Non ego, pauperum

Sanguis parentum, non ego, (quem vocant,)

Dilecte Mæcenas, obibo,

Nec Stygia cohibebor unda.

"*Quem vocant.*] *Quem vocas* is the true reading, confirmed not only by the new and sensible interpretation about to be given, but by the authority of all the Mss. The critics have blundered exceedingly at this passage, and we owe what appears to be the natural and clear construing of the words, to the late Mr. Joseph Fowke of Calcutta, whose judgment Dr. Samuel Johnson and Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, on mature consideration, admitted to be just. For these facts we have the authority of Mr. Francis. The poet supposes himself changed into a bird, and mounting into the skies, *cygnum—in altos nubium tractus*, *Carm. iv. 2*, with Mæcenas anxiously looking up and calling after him; 'whom you call,' *que vous rappelez*.

Siste gradum, teque aspectu ne subtrahere nostro :

Quem fugis?—*Æn. 6.*

There can be no better illustration of *quem vocas*. The idea of quitting this sublunary sphere in the form of a bird is common to the poets. Our Cowley, in imitation of Horace, exclaims;

Lo! how the obsequious wind and swelling air

The Theban swan does upwards bear

Into the walks of clouds, where he does play,

And with extended wings opens his liquid way!

See too the commencement of 'The Ecstasy' by the same bard. Thus also Virg. *G. iii. 8.*

—tentanda via est, qua me quoque possim

Tollere humo, victorque virum volitare per ora.

Still preserving the notion of his flight, he at the conclusion of this Ode desires Mæcenas to abstain from lamentations over his *inane funus*,¹ or cenotaph, that is, 'empty urn;' empty, because not even his ashes remained to be deposited in it, he being actually and wholly gone; or *funeral rites*, idle and vain for one who yet lived, though he no longer trod the earth:—

Nemo me lacrymis decoret, neque funera fletu

Faxit: cur? volito vivu' per ora virum.

Ennius's Epitaph.

¹ "Andromache and Æneas, *Æn. iii. and vi.*, raise an *inanem tumulum* in honor of Hector and Deiphobus, whose bodies they could not possess. This is affirmed in so many words by the latter,—*te, amice, nequivi—Conspicere.* 'Un vain tombeau,' says M. Dacier, 'ou le corps n'est point.'"

Joseph Fowke told Mr. Francis that he had mentioned this criticism many years ago, to Samuel Johnson, who, after rolling himself about *suo more*, said, 'Sir, you are right!' Several years afterwards Mr. Francis asked Mr. G. Wakefield his opinion of the passage, which then ran, with that of most other commentators, in favor of *quem vocas Dilecte*, i. e. *tibi dilectum*, but with which neither he, nor any man of sense, or Latin scholar, could be well pleased. After weighing Mr. Fowke's ingenious interpretation, he said hastily, as if conviction had suddenly flashed on his mind, 'that there could be no doubt of it.' This use of the word *vocare* is confirmed in different degrees by various passages in the classics. Horace *Carm.* i, 14.

Nou di, quos iterum pressa voces malo.

Eurydice, having glided away from Orpheus, vanishing from his sight like smoke 'into thin air,' *cen fumus in auras tenues*, his head, though severed from his body, still called to her to stop or to return—

Eurydiceen anima fugiente vocabat!—Georg. iv.

In the *Æneid*, when Venus quits her son, he would delay her flight by calling, as in the instance of Mæcenas with regard to Horace, *fugientem est voce secutus*, i, 410. More might be added in support of this reading; but an apology is perhaps even now necessary for having called so many witnesses to so clear a case. Sept. 1806."¹

Now with respect to this valuable note, the credit of the interpretation belongs to Mr. Fowke; and as Mr. Fowke was, no doubt, prepared with evidence to support it, we are justified in supposing that the passages quoted to defend it were selected by Mr. Fowke himself, and therefore the note affords no proof of critical sagacity or philological learning in Sir Philip Francis.

3. The second note occurs on the Epistle to the Pisos, v. 361.

Ut platura, poesis; erit quæ, si propius stes, &c.

"*Si propius stes.*"] Aristot. i. 3. (see the passage quoted and commented on by Lambinus in his ed. of Hor. fol. p. 406.) observes some such distinction as this in a public speaker, with respect to his haranguing 'the many,' of πολλοί, or addressing the 'judicious few.' A *σκιωγραφία*, a rough outline or loose sketch, suits the former; but a more finished picture, and one that will bear inspection, may be presented to the latter. The remark is perfectly just. I have heard Edmund Burke say 'that it was impossible the political orations of Demosthenes could have been intelligible to a popular assembly in their present, close, compact form.' SIR PHILIP FRANCIS." In this note I can discern neither erudition nor acumen, but only good sense. For the

¹ "I do not at all approve of Mr. Fowke's and Sir P. Francis's interpretation of *quem vocas*. I am decidedly for

quem vocas

Dilecte, Mæcenas,

'Whom thou gavest the title to, of my dear!' The other sense would be a premature and very awkward anticipation of what afterwards follows, in the fervor of composition. The poet is by no means mounted to that height at the beginning. He begins with matter of fact, his being obscurely born, and yet being a friend of Mæcenas. He then quietly and plainly augurs the immortality of his name, which turned out to be also matter of fact. My dear Sir, he is not mounted on a cloud yet. Gently, gently, good Mr. Fowke! Why should Mæcenas be calling him back? Johnson and Wakefield were surprized into a consent; certainly the former; the latter was capable of a serious consent."—*Extract of a Letter of John Symmons Esq. dated Paris, Jan. 8, 1828.*

reference to Aristotle he acknowledges himself indebted to Lambin's Horace.

4. The third note is this,—Sat. i, 2, 85.

Regibus hic mos est: ubi equos mercantur, opertos
Inspiciunt; &c.

“*Apertos.*] *Opertos*, confirmed by the greater number of Mss., is the right reading. *Operiunt eos*, says the old Scholiast, *ne pulchritudine inducti, emant equos mollibus pedibus*. Montaigne was of this opinion, and has afforded us a very pleasing comment on the passage, which we shall transcribe:—Vous n’achetez pas un chat en poche: si vous marchandez un cheval, vous luy ostez ses bardes, vous le voyez nud et à desouvert: ou, s’il est couvert, comme on les présentait anciennement aux princes à vendre, c’est par les parties moins nécessaires, afin que vous ne vous amusiez pas à la beauté de son poil, ou largeur de sa croupe, et que vous vous arrestiez principalement à considérer les jambes, les yeux, et le pied, qui sont les membres les plus utiles; Regibus etc. Pourquoi estimant un homme, l’estimez-vous tout enveloppé et empaqueté? Il ne nous fait montre que des parties qui ne sont aucunement siennes: et nous cache celles, par lesquelles seules on peut vraiment juger de son estimation? *Essais* tom. i: liv. i. c. 42. This latter part exemplifies in some measure what Horace would say of the Roman matrons, and their peculiar dress. Xenophon, in his tract de Re Equestri, has well illustrated the importance of the feet of horses, by comparing them to the foundation of a house; which being bad, the rest of the structure, however beautiful, is of no value; ὡς περ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἂν εἴη, εἰ τὰ ἄνω πᾶν καλὰ ἔχοι, μὴ ὑποκειμένων οἶων δεῖ θεμελίων, οὕτω καὶ ἵππου πολεμιστηρίου οὐδὲν ἂν ὄφελος εἴη, οὐδ’ εἰ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοι, κακίπους δ’ εἴη.

“My mind,” says the learned Dr. Parr in a private letter to a friend, “was made up on this passage in Horace, before I had read Mr. Francis’s Letter. I peremptorily pronounce in favor of *opertos*. You shall have the history of the reading: ‘all the valuable Mss. are for *opertos*. Lipsius, puzzled at the passage, offered the conjectural reading of *apertos*. Faber and Dacier adopted the conjecture, and supported it by reasonings, which to me are quite unsatisfactory, and against the context. You will be glad to hear that Bentley is σύνψηφος with our friend. I see that with his usual, and to me his delightful, eagerness, Mr. Francis declares against *apertos*. Bentley says very properly: common men, when they purchase common horses, do not find them *opertos*, nor is there any occasion for them to be covered; they have no charms to deceive the eye of the purchaser, and to seduce him from examining their feet, or tempt him to infer from the *breve caput*, etc. that the foot was not tender. You must observe that the horses of the ancients did not wear shoes—that hardness of feet was therefore an essential point—and that in training them the jockeys accustomed them to tread on rough and hard pavement for the purpose of strengthening the hoof. All this you may find in Beckmann’s History of Inventions, under the article Horse-shoe. Now when horses were brought to *reges*, (a word which Horace uses for men of wealth and rank,) they might have the *pulchræ clunes* etc., and these circumstances might deceive the purchaser, and draw off his attention from their feet. To prevent, therefore, all deceit, these beautiful parts were covered; and their effect being destroyed, the purchaser was led to examine the feet. The horses were actually put into body-clothes, though Mr. Fox supposes this absurd. They

were put so, when they were beautiful; though, in ordinary cases, the covering was taken off; and this you may see in the two passages taken from Seneca, and in one from Apuleius by Bentley.

'I see that the Delphin editor prefers *apertus*, ob *clariorem sensum*, and on the authority of some antiqui codices. The *clarius sensus* I cannot discover. If the horses were *aperti*, one does not see any peculiar merit in the inspection. But, when they were *operti*, the *emptor* was in no danger *hamdi* and of being deceived by his eye *quod pulchræ*, etc.

Matronæ, præter faciem, nil cernere possis.

Cætera, ni Catia est, demissa veste tegentis.

'You cannot, therefore, examine her; but do not infer from her having the *niveos viridesque lapillos*, and perhaps a pretty face, that therefore the *femur* is *magis tenerum* etc.: for in the *togata* or common woman, who wore an humble dress, these parts are often prettier. The *matrona* does not expose them; but the *togata* is less delicate: therefore, before you prefer the *matrona* to the *togata*, imitate the cautious circumspection of the *reges*. In purchasing a horse, do not infer that the foot is not *mollis*, because the *facies* is *decora*: in choosing a mistress, do not infer that the *femur* is *tenerum*, because the *facies* is *decora*. Imitate the caution of the horse-purchaser, if you will choose; and as he doubts whether beauty is accompanied by agility, so do you doubt whether beauty in the parts visible is accompanied by beauty in the parts invisible. The circumstance of covering the *claves et cervicem* belongs only to the horse-purchaser, and has no direct counterpart in the case of the lover. It forms a peculiar part of his caution, but it is only the general example of caution, which the lover is to imitate.'

"We are indebted to Sir Philip Francis K.B. for the information contained in this note. Nov. 1806."

For this note Sir Philip does merit more critical and philological praise than he can claim from the other two notes.

To be Continued.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Second Greek Delectus; or a New Analecta Minora. By the Rev. F. VALPY, Trin. Coll. Camb. and one of the Masters of Reading School. 8vo. Price 9s.

This work is intended to be read in schools after Dr. Valpy's Greek Delectus. It retains a third of the Greek of Dalzel's Analecta Minora, and derives the remainder of its Text from other sources. The Notes are in English, are very explanatory of the Syntax and difficulties of the Greek, and are placed by themselves at the end of the Text. The Lexicon is Greek and English; and almost universally facilitates the remembrance of the words of the Greek Text by the insertion of words derived from them in Latin or in English, and by a careful investigation of their derivation. All such difficult parts of verbs *as occur* in the Work are put in their alphabetical order, and referred to their proper sense and root.

The Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. 117 to 120, containing *Manilius* and the *Panegyrici Veteræ*. Pr. 1*l.* 1*s.* per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two Nos. monthly till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

**Ατακτα, ἡγουν παντοδαπῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ τὴν νέαν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοσχεδίῳν σημειώσεων καὶ τινων ἄλλων ὑπομνημάτων αὐτοσχεδίου συναγωγῇ. Τόμος πρῶτος περιέχων δύο ποιήματα Θεοδώρου τοῦ Πτωχοπροδρόμου, μὲ μακρὰς σημειώσεις καὶ πέντε πίνακες.* Paris, 1828. 8vo. (The author is the celebrated Dr. Coray.)

Traité de prononciation Grecque-moderne, à l'usage des Français, par J. B. X. Paris, 1828. 12mo.

Sylloge Epigrammatum Græcorum ex marmoribus et libris collegit et illustravit Frid. Th. Welcker. Edit. altera. Bonnæ, 1828. 8vo.

Le Opere scelte di Giuliano Imperatore per la prima volta dal Greco volgarizzate da Spiridione Petretini Corcirese, con note e con alcuni discorsi illustrativi. Milano, 1822. 8vo.

ΣΥΝΤΙΠΑΣ. Narratio de Syntipa et filio Cyri; Græce e codd. Paris. edidit Jo. Fr. Boissonade. Paris, 1828. 12mo.—We are told that a first volume of *Anecdota Græca*, collected and illustrated by the same professor, will soon appear.

The celebrated Creuzer, Professor of Greek at Heidelberg, informs Mr. Thomas Taylor the Platonist, in a letter to him dated May 26, "that he is daily laboring in the completion of his edition of the works of Plotinus, and that if there is no delay on the part of the Oxford printers, Mr. T. may expect, in the year 1830, to have in his possession all the Enneads of Plotinus, together with Porphyry's life of that philosopher, accompanied by various readings, annotations, and indexes."

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Contents of the 'Journal des Savans' for April, 1828.

1. *Histoire de l'Astronomie au 18me. siècle*, par M. Delambre. [Article de M. Biot.]

2. *Flavii Cresconii Corippi Johannidos seu de bellis Libycis libri vii. editi à codice Mediolanensi Musei Trivultii, operâ et studio Petri Mazzucchelli.* [Article de M. Saint-Martin.]

3. Voyage de la Grèce, par F. C. H. L. Pouqueville. [Article de M. Letronne.]

4. Œuvres posthumes de Boileau, ou Satires de Perse et de Juvénal expliquées, traduites et commentées par Boileau, publiées par M. L. Parelle. [Article de M. Daunou.]

5. Les Métamorphoses d'Aben-Zeid de Séroudj, ou imitation libre des Mekamut ou Seunces de Hariri, par M. F. Rückert. [Art. de M. Silvestre de Sacy.]

6. Histoire Philosophique, Littéraire, Economique des Plantes de l'Europe, par M. J. L. Ponce. [Art. de M. Tessier.]

7. Nouvelles Littéraires.

May.—1. Sur quelques inscriptions inédites trouvées dans la Cyrénaique, par M. Pacho. [Art. de M. Letronne.]

2. Manuel d'Instruction pratique des Sourds-muets, par M. Bébien. [Art. de M. Abel-Rémusat.]

3. Collection de Peintures de l'ancienne école Allemande, de MM. Boisseree et Bertram. [Art. de M. Raoul-Rochette.]

4. Histoire Littéraire de la France, ouvrage commencé par des religieux Bénédictins de la congrégation de S. Maure, et continué par des membres de l'Institut. Tom. xvi. troisième siècle. [Art. de M. Raynouard.]

5. Histoire et Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tom. 8. [Art. de M. Daunou.]

6. Nouvelles Littéraires.

June.—1. De l'Education des Sourds-muets de naissance, par M. De-gerando. [Art. de M. le Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

2. Examen Analytique et Tableau comparatif des Synchronismes de l'Histoire des Temps héroïques de la Grèce, par M. L. C. F. Petit Radet, membre de l'Institut. [Art. de M. Saint-Martin.]

3. Die poesie der Troubadours, &c. La poésie des troubadours, par Fr. Diez. [Art. de M. Raynouard.]

4. Histoire Naturelle des Lavandes, par M. le Baron Frédéric Gignin Lassaraz. [Art. de M. Tessier.]

5. Histoire et Mémoires de l'Institut de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tom. viii. [Art. de M. Daunou.]

Nouvelles Littéraires.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Histoire Générale de l'Inde Ancienne et Moderne, from 2000 years before Christ till the présent period; to which is prefixed a geographical notice, also a treatise on chronology, religion, philosophy and legislation, literature, sciences, arts, and commerce of the Hindoos. A dissertation on the present state of commerce of India with Asia, Africa, and Europe, by M. de Marliès, is also added. 6 vols. in 8vo..

Nouvelle Grammaire Hébraïque, by M. Sarchi, LL.D. Price 8 fr. in 8vo.

Dictionnaire Classique de la Langue Française, with examples drawn from the best French authors and notes extracted from the manuscripts of Rivarol; the terms newly admitted into the lan-

guage which are not to be found in any other dictionary; and about 60,000 new words. Edited and arranged by four Professors of the University. In 8vo.

Euripidis Ion. Lipsiæ, 1827, in 8vo. This new edition of the *Ion* of Euripides is by Prof. Hermann, who has reviewed and corrected the Greek text of that tragedy and added some learned observations.

Libri Wakejii de Mesopotamiæ expugnatione pars, à codice Bibliothecæ Gottingensis Arabico edita, et annotatione illustrata; quâ scripture . . . ad orationem publicam audiendam invitat Georg. Henr. Aug. Ewald, Phil. Doct. Gottingæ, 1827. in 4to.

Examen Analytique et Tableau comparatif des Synchronismes de l'Histoire des Temps Héroïques de la Grèce.—Analytical Examination and Comparative Description of the Heroic Ages of Greece; by L. C. F. Petit Radel, of the Institut Royal of France, 1 vol. in 4to. 12 fr. Paris, 1827.

Theophrasti Characteres quinque priores, cum præmio et sedecim sequentium partibus, nunc primum genuina forma, edd. Chr. Wurmio et Fred. Thierschio.

Atlas de Géographie Ancienne, published under the direction of M. Letronne, pr. 12 fr. There are 17 plates, the first 10 contain maps of the world as known by the ancients; the remaining 7 are plans of Rome and its environs; Carthage and its environs; of Syracuse; of the naval battle of Ecnome; of Cumana; of Athens and its environs; of the battle of Marathon; of the naval battle of Salamine, the Pass of Thermopylæ, &c.

Historia Jemanae, à codice Manuscripto Arabico concinnata; ed. Car. Theod. Johannssen, in 8vo. Bonnæ, 1828.

M. Johansson is a pupil of M. Freytag, Arabic professor at the University of Bonn, and this work of his gained the prize at the Prussian Academy of the Lower Rhine. The title of the work which is written by a learned man born at Zebid, in the 866 year of the *Hejra* is, "The desire of the studious man in what relates to the city of Zebid."

Historia Jacobitarum seu Coptorum, in Egypto, Libyâ, Nubiâ, Æthiopiâ totâ, et Cypri insulæ parte habitantium, operâ J. Abudacni, &c. Lugd. Bat. 1740. in 8vo. 9 fr.

De Concordantiarum Biblicarum maximè Veteris Testamenti Græcarum, Ebræis vocibus respondentium, vario ac multiplici usu, &c., à Conrado Kerchero. Wittemberg, 1622. in 4to.

Dictionnaire Grec-ancien Grec-moderne, after the plan of the Greek and German Dictionary of Reimer, with rules, prosody and accent, by C. M. Koumus. Vienna, 1826. 2 vol. in 4to.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A Letter to MR. ARAGO relating to MR. CHAMPOLLION'S Discoveries.

Geneva, 4th July, 1828.

MY DEAR SIR,

You asked me the other day why I did not publish a simple statement of the dates of the several steps, which I have had the good fortune to make, in the recovery of the literature of the Egyptians; and I told you that I thought I had done quite as much as was necessary for asserting my claim, and that I had no reason to be over-anxious for establishing it any further than the public at large was perfectly willing to concede it me: I thought Mr. Champollion had been unjust to me, but I freely forgave him, without requiring him to acknowledge his injustice; and, on the other hand, I was inclined to believe that he had also forgiven me, without my having made any concession to him. But since *you* were disposed to think that he had some reason to complain of me, and since I have publicly acknowledged that *you* have always shown yourself to be *at least* impartial in any question which related to my credit, I cannot help feeling myself bound to afford you some further explanation, on the points which you thought liable to exception in my book. You seem to have judged, as a mathematician, that Mr. Champollion had convicted me of an arithmetical error, with respect to the numerical amount of the Phonetic characters which I had ascertained; and you thought in the second place that my alphabet must have been good for nothing, because it had led me to a wrong interpretation of the word CESARIS, which I made into ARSINOE.

Now of the nine letters, which I insist that I had discovered, Mr. Champollion himself allows me five, and I maintain that a single one would have been sufficient for all that I wished to prove; the method by which that one was obtained being allowed to be correct, and to be capable of further application. The true foundation of the analysis of the Egyptian system of writing, I insist, is the great fact of the original identity of the enchorial with the sacred characters, which I discovered and printed in 1816, and which Mr. Champollion probably rediscovered, and certainly republished, in 1821; besides the reading of the name of Ptolemy, which I had completely ascertained and published in 1814, and the name of Cleopatra, which Mr. Banks had afterwards discovered by means of the information that I sent him out to Egypt, and which he asserts that he communi-

VOL. XXXVIII. C. II. NO. LXXV. L

cated indirectly to Mr. Champollion : and whatever deficiencies there might have been in my original alphabet, supposing it to have contained but one letter correctly determined, they would and must have been gradually supplied by a continued application of the same method to other monuments which have been progressively discovered and made public since the date of my first paper.

In fact, however, besides the five letters which Mr. Champollion allows me, there are three others which he only refuses to admit because I had conjectured that they contained some vowels, in addition to the consonants, which I was well aware were their most important parts. His L I had read oLE, his S, oS, and his M, MA ; and I still believe that every reader of the oriental languages, except, perhaps, Mr. Silvestre de Sacy, will readily admit that these approximations are practically paramount to correct determinations ; and that it was no injustice to Mr. Champollion to say that I had discovered at least EIGHT of the old Egyptian letters : nor will there be any great difficulty in adding to the number the character B, which I had supposed might be BIR, though its resemblance to the enchorial B was sufficiently striking ; and when the R of BERENICE was afterwards identified, the correction of my approximation to the B followed as a matter of course. Another s or SH of Mr. Champollion I had made a K, though I was well aware that it was very probably the SH of the Egyptian SHERI : but Mr. Salt has observed that the occurrence of this character in BERENICE arose from an error of the draughtsman.

With respect to the repetition of the same letters in different forms, they by no means require to be enumerated as separate discoveries ; since there must be no limit to the diversity they admit, either according to my original opinion of the arbitrary employment of syllabic characters, after the manner of the Chinese, or upon Mr. Champollion's "system" of the phonetic signification of the various hieroglyphics, expressing the initial letters only of the names of the object which they represent. It is obviously easy to multiply their interpretation almost without end, by merely comparing the different modes of writing parallel passages in different manuscripts or inscriptions, or in different parts of the same monuments. A countryman of my own had identified the use of the vase as an N, by a comparison of this kind, and I therefore inserted the initial of his name in my table, although his communication to me had been private only.

I trust that these remarks will convince you either that I have not done Mr. Champollion injustice by my numerical claims, or

that if I have committed any arithmetical mistakes, they are not such as could have arisen from a desire to misrepresent the facts as they actually occurred, since I could have had no motive for exaggeration, while the admissions of my opponent were fully sufficient for my purpose.

With respect to my supposing that the word *CÆSARIS* was intended to be read *ARSINOË*, the mistake had no effect whatever on the letters identified by other means: it was not from the letters that I was led to believe I had read the word, but having fancied that I had identified the name by *external* evidence, I endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to employ it in extending my interpretation of the phonetic hieroglyphics. In fact, I had inferred from my own previous discoveries, that the inscription containing the name was posterior to the times of the Egyptian kings; and I imagined, as I suppose every body else did at the time in question, that the genuine hieroglyphic inscriptions were all, or nearly all, anterior to the times of the Roman emperors. I therefore concluded that the personage in question must have belonged to the family of the Ptolemies: this was an error, but it was an error that did not affect the interpretation of the nine letters which I have claimed, and which I still claim, as my own. I spoke of Mr. Champollion's more rapid flight, not in a tone of irony, but of uncertainty; and you will recollect that when I had agreed, in conversation with one of his opponents in the Institute, that he must be called an enthusiast, I induced that gentleman to give him credit for sincerity and good faith, combined with his enthusiasm: and I am most ready to admit, that the more I see of his researches, the more I admire his ingenuity as well as his industry; and I must be eager to bear witness on every occasion to the kindness and liberality which he has shown me in either giving or procuring for me copies of every thing that I have asked of him, out of the treasures entrusted to his care by the magnificent liberality of a government, which far outshines the richest of its rivals, in the encouragement of literature, and science, and art. I have obtained in this manner a most extensive collection of enchorial documents, many of which are accompanied by Mr. Champollion's own interpretations of particular passages, which amply demonstrate how unjustly he has been supposed to have neglected this department of the great field, which he has cultivated with such unparalleled success.

Believe me always, my dear Sir,

Your truly obliged *confrère* . . .

P.S. *Park Square*, 30 August, 1828. My visit to the continent has been most successful in the acquisition of such documents as I have long been extremely anxious to possess: at Geneva I received from Turin, by the kindness of the Chevalier San Quintino, some very excellent casts of the bilingual inscription which I wished to purchase of Drovetti seven years ago: though I am sorry to say I fear I shall be able to decipher but very few words of the remains of the enchorial part. The hieroglyphic inscription, though short, is of great importance, in exhibiting the name of the deity whom Champollion calls Amonra, while the Greek contains in several places, as Mr. Peyron has already observed, the name Amonrasother, before known from Mr. Grey's Antigraph only.

On my return through Paris I found the copies of TEN select enchorial papyri ready for me: one of them I soon recognised as a duplicate of Grey B, already published in the "Hieroglyphics," but with such slight variations as render it extremely valuable for comparison: besides the names of sixteen witnesses on the back. This manuscript has been framed and glazed in the Louvre; it had been observed by Mr. Peyron: there is also a triplicate, without the registry. The day before my departure from Paris, I received from Mr. Peyron two very important papers, illustrative of the Greek papyri of Turin and of Vienna, with some interesting applications of the enchorial numbers to the lands of the Cholchytæ, by which I shall not fail to profit in my further investigations; though I have not been able to consult the original papyrus of Mr. Grey, respecting which he asks me for an explanation of a particular character.

NOTE. I have unexpectedly had an opportunity of re-examining Mr. Grey's enchorial manuscript, and I find that the angle of the *I'* has been omitted in the copy, from an accidental fold in the papyrus; but that the reading is clearly *IT'*, as was naturally to be expected for $3\frac{1}{2}$. Mr. Peyron is inclined to believe that *ημισους ογδοου* is to be understood simply one-eighth: but whoever is conversant with the Greek astronomers, will immediately perceive that it means *five-eighths*; as we have perpetually *ες γ', ημισυ τρίτον*, in Ptolemy, for *five-sixths*, or $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}$. For *one-sixth*, Mr. Grey's Antigraph has *ημισυ τὸν τρίτον*.—Sept. 10.

The Observations of *Eborak* came too late for the present No.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

N^o. LXXVI.

DECEMBER, 1828.

NOTICE OF

Researches into the Origin and Affinity of the principal Languages of ASIA and EUROPE. By
LIEUT.-COL. VANS KENNEDY, of the Bombay Establishment. London, 4to. 1828. Longman and Co.

It would be equally unjust towards our numerous readers who delight in philological speculations, as towards the accomplished author of this important work, were a notice of it to be deferred for three months, merely because our present limits and our leisure do not allow so elaborate an account as its subject and execution claim and deserve. We shall, therefore, proceed to state without further preamble, the chief contents of this volume, which is divided into two parts, containing altogether three hundred and forty pages, besides eleven plates, (some of which are folded and of considerable size,) from the excellent lithographic press of Hullmandel.

In the first part, to the Preface and Chap. i. (comprising "Introductory Remarks,") succeed Ch. ii. On the "Language of the Hebrews." Ch. iii. "The Arabic Language." Ch. iv. "The ancient languages of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt." Ch. v. "On the Scythians." Ch. vi. "The Celtic language." Ch. vii. "The Greek language." Ch. viii. "The Latin language." Ch. ix. "On the Greek, Latin, and Sanscrit Alphabetical Systems." Ch. x. "The German and English languages." Ch. xi. "The Persian language." Ch. xii. "The Sanscrit language." Ch. xiii. "Remarks concluding the first part."

In the second part we find "Grammatical and Etymological Illustrations." (p. 239.) "List of Sanscrit words which are found in

VOL. XXXVIII. Cl. II. NO. LXXVI. M

166 Notice of Kennedy's *Researches into*

the Greek, Latin, Persian, German and English languages." (p. 277.)—And an Appendix consisting of three articles." No. I. "List of Sanscrit, Persian and Arabic words which occur in the Zend Vocabulary of Anquetil du Perron." No. II. "List of Persian and Arabic words which occur in the Pahlvi Vocabulary of Anquetil du Perron." No. III. "List of Pahlvi words which are not contained in the Vocabulary of Anquetil du Perron, extracted from the fourth section of the *Firhang Jihangiri*."

In the preface our ingenious author declares himself (as we believe him to be) uninfluenced by the spirit of hypothesis to which so many able writers have sacrificed, by indulging in absurdity of etymologies and mis-selection and perversion of authorities, to such a degree that much ridicule has been thrown, not only on philological discussions, but on arguments respecting the origin and affinity of nations, and even on their idolatry.

"The following *Researches*," says Colonel Kennedy, "whatever other defects may be attributed to them, are, at least, free from the spirit of hypothesis. For, having occasion to compile a Maratha dictionary, I amused myself while collecting materials for that work, in noting down the Sanscrit words which I recognised as belonging to any language with which I was acquainted; and it was not until I had collected five hundred such words, that I began to inquire into the causes which could have introduced them into five distinct languages. Until then I had acquiesced in the correctness of the usual opinions entertained respecting the origin and affinity of languages, although doubts of their justness had often occurred to me. But on further examining the subject, I found that none of the systems which had been proposed could adequately explain the causes of that intimate connexion which must have existed at some remote period, between a people speaking Sanscrit and the ancestors of the Greeks, Romans, and Goths.

Our author, it appears, sought a more satisfactory explanation, and in 1822 laid before the Literary Society of Bombay, a paper containing the result of his investigation. But this he afterwards withdrew, having been enabled to enlarge and improve it into the form of those "*Researches*" which we here announce. His original object was merely to ascertain the causes which had produced so remarkable an affinity as is known to exist between the Greek, Latin, Persian, Gothic, and Sanscrit languages; but he found that this could not be accomplished in a satisfactory manner, unless the prevailing hypothesis concerning the existence of a primitive tongue, and the origin of the Greeks, Romans, and Goths, were first examined and refuted. Col. K. with due severity notices the erroneous opinions expressed in a dogmatic tone by Dr. A. Murray in his *History of European Languages*, and exposes that writer's ignorance, not only of the Sanscrit, but of the Persian; observing in the caustic phrase of Pinkerton, as an excuse for having rarely quoted the Doctor's work, that "*to confute absolute*"

nonsense is surely as ridiculous as to write it ;" and he characterises the "History of European Languages" in the very words which its author applied to Bryant's "Analysis of Ancient Mythology:" *"a fanciful work, of which the etymological part is false, the historical dubious, and the theoretical imaginary."* We must here remark the intrepidity with which Col. K. (allowing, however, praise on all occasions where it is due) asserts his own opinions in direct contradiction to those of many learned and illustrious men, dead and living, whose very names would almost awe into tacit acquiescence a writer not perfectly convinced of his own correctness and of his ability to correct their errors. Thus he does not hesitate (p. 3.) to expose the "inconsistency and self-contradiction" of Sir William Jones, and the impossibility of reconciling his "conclusion with the premises from which it has been deduced," viz. : "that the language of Noah is lost irretrievably;" and he pronounces "untenable," Sir William's hypothesis "that the Aborigines of Persia were Hindus." (p. 189.) The opinion of Mr. Turner respecting the Anglo-Saxon language is in opposition, says Col. K., to the very examples adduced in support of it. (p. 152.) Cour de Gebelin, on the Celtic, errs "against every principle of etymology." (p. 226.) Having quoted a passage from M. de Sacy, affirming that the phraseology and syntax of Persian were formed under the influence of Arabic, our learned author immediately declares that

"no opinion can be more erroneous; because the Persian bears not the slightest affinity to Arabic, and never were two languages so strongly distinguished by dissimilar properties. In Arabic, there is an article, in Persian none," &c. (p. 171.)

We might refer to similar remarks, more or less severe, on Anquetil du Perron, Bryant, Adelung, Grotfend, Klaproth, Horne Tooke, Leibnitz, Faber, Carlyle; the French translators of Strabo; the Quarterly Reviewers; Dr. Jamieson; Bentley (on Hindu Astronomy); Townsend (Hist. of Moses); Rémusat, Von Hammer, and others.

From notions inculcated early in life it might naturally be expected that a Treatise on the Origin and Affinity of Languages should begin with a reference to the Biblical records. We find, accordingly, the following passage which occurs after a few lines in the introductory chapter :

"Admitting, therefore, the Mosaic account of the creation of mankind, and supposing that the faculty and knowledge of speech were communicated to the first man and woman by the Supreme Being, nothing would seem more probable than the existence of a primitive language. Moses also relates that such actually prevailed during the earlier ages of the world; but he, at the same time, expressly declares that this uniformity of speech was destroyed by a miracle. It, consequently, the authority of Moses be admitted as proving the one point, it

168 *Notice of Kennedy's Researches into*

must be considered of equal validity with respect to the other—because no other works now exist with which the narration of Moses might be compared, and by means of which any errors that may have occurred in it might be corrected. The whole, therefore, of the Book of Genesis must be held to be authentic, or the whole must be rejected; and that argument deserves no attention, which rests on a partial admission and a partial rejection of the contents of this book. But the following verses of the eleventh chapter of Genesis prove beyond the power of controversy to dispute, that the primitive language of mankind was totally destroyed. ‘And the whole earth was of one language, and one speech. And the Lord said, Behold the people is one, and they have all one language. Go to, let us go down and there confound their language that they may not understand one another’s speech,’ &c. and in the tenth chapter: ‘But these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.’—So far, therefore, as the authority of the Book of Genesis is admitted, it must at the same time be admitted that the primitive speech of mankind was abolished, and various distinct languages created by the same power by whom the former was originally communicated to mankind.” (p. 3.)

Notwithstanding the occurrence of some cognate and identical terms in different languages, our ingenious author regards it as a mistaken opinion, that the Mosaic account of the creation would be confirmed by proving Hebrew the origin of tongues. But his object is not to assign one primitive language as the source of all others—it is

“merely to exhibit the striking affinity that exists between the Sanscrit, Greek; Latin, Persian, and Gothic languages.” “As, therefore, the only satisfactory proof in all etymological inquiries is identity of terms, I now produce a collection of nine hundred Sanscrit words which exist either in Greek, Latin, Persian, German, or English; all these words are primitives or uncompound; and when it is recollected that these form but a small proportion of the words contained in any language, it must appear the more surprising that so many of the Sanscrit primitives can still be discovered, after the lapse of ages, in languages now so widely separated.” (p. 10.)

That Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind, has been asserted by many learned writers, who have not, however, explained the manner in which all other tongues have been derived from it: and in fact, our author declares that such an opinion is directly opposite to the conclusions which he has been led to form. (p. 10.) He thinks that the texts of Genesis above quoted must embarrass those who regard Hebrew as the parent of all tongues; and, in his second chapter, examines some points of Jewish history to ascertain whether or not the Hebrew ever exerted any influence over the languages of Asia and Europe. The result of his inquiry on this subject is briefly, that the language of Abraham could not have influenced any other than those of Egypt and Palestine; but that Abraham, when he went into those countries from Ur of Chaldea, found them already civilised mo-

narchical states : it is scarcely credible that they would have exchanged their own tongue for that of a stranger. To show that the Hebrews had not the means of extending their language beyond the confines of Palestine, Col. K. quotes a passage from Josephus (contr. Appion. i. 12 :)

"Geography, Chronology and History, therefore," adds he, "demonstrate the impossibility of Hebrew being the primitive tongue from which all other languages are derived." (p. 19.)

He further mentions, that having carefully examined the lexicons of Buxtorf and Castell, he was not able to discover a single Hebrew word that could be identified with any term in Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, German or English. He disproves the assertion of Mr. Townsend, that Sanscrit and Hebrew have a radical affinity ; notices the remarkable difference of their grammatical structure, and of that which exists between the Hebrew and Greek, 'a structure which must have been "peculiar to each distinct tongue and even to each cognate dialect of the same language, and must have been coeval with the origin of each." (p. 21.)

If Greek and Sanscrit were derived from Hebrew, how could they acquire those numerous inflections of nouns and verbs which give such precision and variety, while the alleged parent tongue possesses scarcely any inflections? Would the daughters luxuriate in the beauty and elegance of compound terms, while the mother abhors the ornament of composition?

"In short, to what causes shall be ascribed the copious richness of Sanscrit and Greek, if they owe their origin to a language which has been always remarkable for its irremediable poverty?" "Until, however, these questions are satisfactorily answered, it must be evident that a few forced resemblances between Hebrew words and those of other languages, will never prove in the slightest degree, that Hebrew is the primitive tongue from which all other languages have been derived." (p. 21.)

Did such a primitive language still exist, Arabia might perhaps claim it with stronger pretensions than any other country ; for both tradition and history declare, that although partially conquered, Arabia was never occupied by a foreign people. In his second chapter our author examines the Arabic language, which, in the words of Sir W. Jones, "is unquestionably one of the most ancient in the world ;" and internal evidence shows its perfect originality : but Col. K. is not willing to allow the vast number of its words, nor the precision of phrases for which it has been celebrated by Jones, Richardson, Walton, and others. He says that the very genius of Arabic consists in its rudeness and imperfection, and that the monotonous

"uniformity in the structure of its periods could not be avoided ; for the least change in the accustomed place of the noun, verb, or particle, would at once render the sense ambiguous, if not unintelligible." (p. 30.)

He then notices the intimate affinity that Hebrew bears to Arabic both in words and grammatical structure, showing that they were probably dialects of the language spoken by those who originally peopled Arabia and Syria, meaning Syria in its most ample extent. With the peculiar structure of Arabic and Hebrew, tradition and history combine to prove that those languages could not have given origin to all others. The Phœnician may here be objected, but without reason ; for if it was, as generally supposed, an Arabic or Hebrew dialect,

"the non-existence in Greek of Arabic or Hebrew words, proves that the introduction of letters into Greece by Cadmus (if such an event ever happened) operated no change in the language of the country, and all chronologists place the foundation of Carthage posterior to Homer." (p. 33.)

It seems, therefore, that Arabia and Syria were inhabited from time immemorial, by a distinct race speaking a peculiar language, which, with its cognate dialects never extended beyond those countries, except to a small part of Africa.

We cannot follow our ingenious author as closely as might be wished, through his interesting remarks on the dialects of ancient Babylonia, Assyria, and that country to which the unanimous voice of history assigns an equal degree of antiquity, Egypt. He doubts that the Greeks received their language or religion in any degree from the Egyptians. If the Egyptian language contributed towards the formation of Greek, it could not have been Arabic, or one of its cognate dialects ; for not an Arabic word can be found in Greek, and the grammatical structure of the languages radically differs. (p. 42.) The fourth chapter closes with a remark that

"the civilisation of Egypt, and the establishment of its peculiar frame of government, may be with much justice ascribed to Babylonia." (p. 45.)

Col. K. finds his progress impeded (in the fifth chapter) by the opinions of many learned men who ascribe the origin of Greek, Latin, and Teutonic to the Celtic or Scythic. But respecting the Scythians and their language, he regards the opinions of all writers, except Pinkerton, as vague, inconsistent, and unsatisfactory. Still he does not implicitly agree to every assertion of Pinkerton. That the Scythians were known in Homer's time, can only be inferred from the meaning given to two lines of the *Iliad*, (xiii. 5, 6.)

Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων, καὶ ἀγανῶν Ἰππημολγῶν,
Γλακτοφάγων, ἄβρων τε δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων.

founded on a circumstance of too general a nature to identify any pastoral race ; while the two verses preceding would prove that the Ἰππημολγοί, Γλακτοφάγοι, and Ἀβριοί were a Thracian people, as Strabo allows the Μυσοί to have been. And Rennell explains the opinion of Herodotus, that "*where Thrace ends, Scythia begins.*" Our author will not adopt the sentiments of Dr. Jamieson, who

declares that the "Thracians were of Scythic origin:" and he ridicules the idea of a person in Edinburgh pretending to correct, without the assistance of other ancient writers, the observations made by Herodotus 2200 years previously. (p. 64.) That the Scythians were confounded with the Celts, appears from many passages of different authors; as have also been the Persians, Phrygians, and Thracians; but without any ancient authority, for it cannot be proved that Europe owes its population or languages to a Celtic people: the Greeks, respecting them, only knew that they lived in the west; and it is allowed by all, that the remains of their language abound with Greek, Latin, and Teutonic words: these in Col. K.'s opinion, do not show that the Celts were ever the same with those who spoke the Greek, Latin, and Teutonic, but borrowed the foreign terms from their Roman and German conquerors. (p. 68.)

"If the Celts in Britain and Ireland are indebted to strangers for words to express writing, and even for their numerals, as the mere inspection of such etymologies sufficiently proves, it cannot for a moment be supposed that either Greeks, Romans, or Germans, could have received from so rude a people any terms indicative of the objects peculiar to a much higher state of civilisation than they had attained." (p. 77.)

Our author concludes his sixth chapter by allowing that Celtic is a perfectly original language, when divested of all words that have been introduced into it by conquest and religion; but, adds he,

"this originality incontrovertibly proves, that neither Greek, Latin, or the Teutonic dialects, nor Arabic, Persian or Sanscrit, were derived from the Celtic, since these languages have not any affinity whatever with that tongue." (p. 85.)

Our limits will scarcely allow even a hasty glance at the chapter (vii.) which treats of the Greek language, and deserves particular attention. Col. K. regards the true descent of the Greeks as a point not yet determined, since no one has explained by what means the rude speech of a mixed people, Pelasgians, barbarian aborigines, Phœnicians and Egyptians, became

"refined into that homogeneous and polished language by which the poems of Homer are distinguished." (p. 86.)

He denies the introduction of letters into Greece by Cadmus, and seems convinced that Homer was not a Greek, but a native of Asia Minor, and that his poems are written in the language of that country, from which, as he believes, Greece derived her people and her language. Asia Minor must have received its inhabitants from the conterminous region, Mesopotamia; and as a language actually exists at this day in Asia which can be identified with Greek, in numerous words, and in grammatical structure, the Asiatic origin of Greek can scarcely be disputed. An exami-

172 Notice of Kennedy's *Researches into*

nation of the comparative table (given in Part II.) will prove the Sanscrit to be, either the parent tongue from which Greek, Latin, and Teutonic have been derived, or, at least, the language which has best preserved the undeniable marks of their common parentage. (p. 105.)

Our author's system now appears manifest: we do not, however, accuse him of sacrificing to it either sense or probability. He is willing to suppose that Sanscrit, which now flourishes only in India, was the original language of Babylonia, from which conterminous region Asia Minor was peopled in an early period of the world; and that Greece received the Sanscrit words and grammar from the intermediate country, Asia Minor. The Greek language was completely formed before the time of Homer; and ancient writers show, that after his time no such communication subsisted among the Greeks, Latins, or Goths, or could have effected any radical change in their respective languages:

"These, consequently, had received that form which they have in every essential respect preserved until the present day, at least a thousand years before Christ. Let, therefore, the attention be fixed on this remote date; let the relative position of India and Greece be considered; and let the remarkable affinity that exists between Greek, Latin, Gothic and Sanscrit be examined; and then the extreme probability of the hypothesis now proposed will at once become evident." (p. 106.)

He would, of course, deduce Latin from the same country to which Greece was indebted for her language, (chap. viii.) observing that the difference between Greek and Latin proves, on the soundest principles of philology, that the latter was not derived from the former, but that both languages were originally the same, for they differ chiefly in words, and bear the closest affinity to each other in their grammatical structure. But our reader must consult the "Researches" themselves, that he may justly appreciate the accomplished author's argument: and we must rapidly turn over the ninth chapter, in which different alphabetical systems are ably discussed, and strong proofs adduced to show that the Pelasgic, Latin, and Sanscrit letters were originally the same. (p. 133.) We must despatch with equal rapidity the interesting observations on German and English, given in the tenth chapter. Col. K. devotes his eleventh chapter to the Persian language. He thinks that the ancient Pahlvi differed only from the modern dialect of Persia, in being free from any admixture of Arabic words; and he doubts very strongly the authenticity of those Zend and Pahlvi works which the Parsis or Gahrs of India and Persia regard as the compositions of Zardusht or Zoroaster and other ancient personages. Col. K. denies that the modern Persian (such as it appears in the *Shah Namah* of *Firdausi*) is derived from Zend, Pahlvi, or Arabic: it does not in any degree resemble them, and proves its originality by a grammatical structure peculiar to itself,

and contains no foreign words except Sanscrit; for the few Greek terms that now occur in it, were evidently introduced from the Sanscrit. The pure dialect, therefore, of Persia at the present time, our author pronounces to be the very same as prevailed in that country from the remotest antiquity. (p. 185.) But he does not derive it from India, although 260 Sanscrit words are found in the pure Persian; and as 55 of these Sanscrit words occur equally in Greek, it follows that they must have passed into Persian before the poems of Homer were written, because the Greek was at that time completely formed. It is known that the Hindus never made foreign conquests—indeed were not allowed to leave their country.

"The establishment in Persia, therefore, of a people speaking Sanscrit, must evidently have preceded their entrance into India; and, if not aborigines of the country, they must necessarily have immigrated into it from some other kingdom. Thus, again, the conjecture irresistibly presents itself, that this people speaking Sanscrit could be no other than a numerous colony which had migrated from Babylon on its conquest by the Ninus of Herodotus, part of which established itself in Persia, and part proceeded on to India." (p. 190.)

We shall not attempt to epitomise the very important chapter on Sanscrit. (ch. xii.) And from the concluding remarks in the thirteenth we shall only extract this passage.

"But if the Mosaic history be set aside, it is perfectly evident that all speculations respecting the original peopling of the world can rest on no foundation whatever; for the first dawning of profane tradition and history is scarcely discernible earlier than 1200 or 1300 years B. C. It is impossible, therefore, to determine what may have been the previous state of the world, or to ascertain the origin of the languages which then prevailed; but judging from their internal evidence, it seems indisputable, that neither the Greek, Latin, nor Gothic, are original tongues, and consequently other languages must have previously existed from which they were formed. One of these is discoverable in Sanscrit, from which one-seventh of the primitive words of Greek, Latin, and Gothic have been derived: but whence did the remaining six-sevenths originate? It is the same with most other languages; for it is now impossible to ascertain the source from which Hebrew and Arabic have received the words not common to both, or the Teutonic dialects the words which are found in one and not in all of them. In the course, also, of these Researches, it has equally appeared; that the Sanscrit, Arabic, Persian, Tartar, and Celtic, are original and distinct languages, which bear no relation to each other. It seems, therefore, necessarily to follow that no traces of the existence of a primitive tongue can now be discovered; and that *all* languages bear not an affinity to each other; and consequently, that the people who originally spoke them, could not possibly be all branches of one and the same stem." (p. 220.)

Thus the reader has seen that our author regards Babylonia as the primeval seat of Sanscrit, which, through Asia Minor, was thence communicated by the Pelasgi, to Thracia, Greece, Latium, and Hetruria;—that a colony from Babylonia once exercised a pre-

174 Notice of Kennedy's Researches, &c.

dominating influence in Persia ;—and that the affinity of Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Persian and Gothic, are thus satisfactorily explained. And he concludes his grammatical and etymological illustrations by observing the several points of coincidence, such

“as, united to the nine hundred Sanscrit words still found in them, must render it in the highest degree probable that Sanscrit is the parent tongue from which the Greek, Latin, and Gothic languages have derived their origin.” (p. 275.)

For the contents of Part II. we must refer our readers to the beginning of this Notice. The eleven plates exhibit various ancient alphabets, Phœnician, Pelasgian, Hebraic, Samaritan, Etruscan, Greek ; Bengali, Nagari, and others of India ; the Persian, Pahlvi, and Zend ; besides inscriptions and specimens of writing in different characters, some of which have not yet been deciphered. We shall here remark, that of the Phœnician alphabet (given by Dutens (and copied here), two or three of the letters have always appeared to us rather doubtful. A friend who has devoted considerable attention to the ancient Persic, is not altogether satisfied with the Zend cuneiform alphabet given in plate E ; and regrets that Col. Kennedy has borrowed from books already published (Sir W. Jones's works, and Anquetil du Perron's *Zendavesta*,) the specimens of Persic writing (in plate F, No. 1.) when he might easily have procured *fac-similes* from original manuscripts at Bombay. Our friend, however, is as sceptical on the subject of Zend and Pahlvi compositions (those that exist among the present Parsis) as Col. K. himself ; and he thinks it a strong negative proof against their authenticity and value, that neither Baron de Sacy nor Sir Wm. Ouseley have thought them worthy of their attention, but content themselves, in this branch of philology, with having deciphered and explained, many years ago, some inscriptions in the pure Sassanian Pahlvi. Yet each of those Orientalists might have extracted whatever was interesting or curious from an ample collection of the modern fire-worshipper's Zend and Pahlvi manuscripts,—the learned Frenchman from those procured at Surat and brought to Paris by Anquetil du Perron, Sir Wm. Ouseley from those which he himself collected among the Gabrs in Persia.

We must now take leave of our accomplished author, hoping that he will, by future publications, afford to the lovers of philological research additional pleasure and instruction.

DE GRÆCÆ LINGUÆ DIALECTIS.

A GODOF. HERMANNO.

GRÆCÆ linguæ cognitio his temporibus paucorum quidem, sed eximiorum hominum studiis, eos progressus fecit, ut doctrinæ loco haberi posse incipiat. Doctrinam autem dicimus ejusmodi scientiam, quæ et certis fundamentis nitatur, et leges quasdam habeat, quibus amplificari et perpoliri possit. Nam et multa, quæ ante dubia erant, nunc explorata habemus, et alia, de quibus ante nemo dubitabat, nescire nos scimus: ita ut altera horum ignorare, altera scire turpe sit. Id quum nonnulli non videantur intellexisse, horum eos; qui sciunt quæ sciri nequeunt, plerumque nota nescire; illos autem, qui nesciunt nota, scire quæ non possunt sciri videas. A qua levitate, quæ nihil literis est perniciosius, ut dehortarer tirones, quibus hæc destinata est scriptio, visum est quædam de Græcæ linguæ dialectis dicere, non illa quidem ignota, sed multis tamen neglecta. Est autem hic locus maximi momenti, quod sine accurata ejus cognitione nullus de Græcis scriptoribus ita, ut par est, tractari potest. Patet enim latissime, neque in formis quibusdam et terminationibus vocabulorum consistit, sed in constructione verborum, in significatione, in colore totius orationis, in metris et mensura, multisque aliis in partibus versatur, ad quas animadvertendas illustrandasque diligentissima lectione, acutissimo judicio, sæpe etiam curiosa antiquitatis et historiæ pervestigatione opus est. Nondum exstitit, qui Græcæ linguæ dialectos eo studio, quo decebat, explicaret, præter H. Stephanum, qui quidem soli Atticæ dialecto operam adhibuit, sed eam tantæ cum cura, tantaque cum eruditione, ut nihil postea, quod cum illo libro comparari posset, in hoc genere editum sit. Quamquam quæ hic scripsit, non leviter aucta sunt quum aliorum, tum Dawesii diligentia, cujus vestigia, sed nimis religiose, sectatus est Brunckius: nostra autem ætate plurimas contulit atque egregias observationes R. Porsonus. Reliquas dialectos qui accurate persequeretur, nemo inventus est. Nam præter quasdam Hemsterhusii et Valekenarii adnotationes, Kœnius ad Gregorii libellum, more gentis suæ, multas formulas congerere satis habuit, nihil generatim disserens; Maistairius autem operoso labore, sed sine judicio, promiscue bona mala collegit:

Qui de Græcæ linguæ dialectis dicere instituebant, initium disputationis, mea sententia, ab ea lingua repetere debebant, ex qua istæ diversitates, quæ dialecti vocantur, ortæ sunt. Enimvero qualis fuerit ista lingua nescimus. Fateor: verumtamen formis, quibus dialecti inter se differunt, colligendis et comparandis non modo hoc efficitur, ut, quæ sint antiquiores, quæ recentiores, appareat, sed etiam ratio intelligitur, qua quæque dialectus in mutandis verborum formis usa sit. Sic vero ea quoque, quæ prima specie levia esse videntur, idoneis judiciis, quid antiquissimum

fuerit, aperiunt. Est autem interdum non parvi momenti, scire, quid commune fuerit Græcæ linguæ, antequam temporum locorumque mutationibus in varias formas distrahieretur. Celebre exemplum afferamus, digamma Æolicum, quod alii in Homeri Hesiodique scriptis usurpatum contendunt, alii ab his scriptoribus abjudicant. Abhorret, inquit hi, ab Homero, scriptore Ionico, Æolicæ literæ usus. Id qui primus dixit, per jocum, opinor, dixit: sed arripuerunt alii, et vel conviciis pro ea opinione pugnant. Quid vero? Multis argumentis cognoscitur, ista litera non solos usos esse Æolenses, sed Dorienses omnes, et esse hunc usum adeo antiquum, ut initio universæ Græciæ communis fuisse videatur. Quid ergo mirum, si hanc literam etiam Iones antiquissimis temporibus usurpabant, donec ea paulatim ex usu et ore hominum emigraret? Nihil huic conjecturæ nisi nomen obstat. At quis non videt, quum Dorienses rudes essent literarum, ii autem, qui Ioniam et insulas Æolicas tenebant, primi ad artes et poesin animum adjicerent, nomen literæ Æolicæ non ad sonum, sed ad solam spectare notam, qua Æoles sonum ab antiquis acceptum scribendo indicaverint. Dorienses si prius scriptis inclaruissent, Dorica vocata esset litera, qua Arcades etiam ante natam in cœlo lunam usi fuerant. Igitur quum soli Æolenses digamma singulari nota indicarent, reliqui Græci, apud quos hæc nota non erat in usu, alias literas, ubi digamma scribendum esset, adhibebant. Et quum digamma proprie triplici sono significando videatur inseruisse, uni labiali, qui apud Latinos *v*, apud nos *w* est; alii, qui pene ad vocalem *u* accedit, ut Britannorum *w*; tertio gutturali, qui nunc asperior et plenior erat quam *χ*, nunc propemodum ut *gu* vel *ng* proferebatur; hi soni, et qui ex iis orti sunt, per *β*, per *ο*, per *υ*, per *γ*, per spiritum asperum, per *σ*, per *ρ*, et apud Romanos per *qu* indicabantur. De litteris *β*, *υ*, *γ*, et spiritu aspero apud omnes constat. Cur reliquas addiderim, intelligent, qui similia consideraverint, ut *οἶκος*, *῾Οἰλέως*, *Μοῦσα*, *aurarum*, *quoι*, *quem*: in quibus vocibus digammi vestigia aperiunt hæc formæ, *vicus*, *Ιλεός*, *Μῶα*, *ἀνράων*, *οἶ*, *ἔ*. Quoniam genitivi *aurarum* mentionem feci, qui manifesto Græcam originem habet, non abs re esse puto, etiam secundæ Latinorum declinationis genitivum tetigisse. Qui quum indicio sit, vetustissimos Græcos *οἰκῶρων* et similia dixisse, et inde *οἰκῶων* et *οἰκων* exstitisse, dubitari poterit, an Homeri *ἑάων* et Hesiodi *βλεφάρων ἀπὸ κυανέων*, et quæ horum exemplo recentiores poetæ perierunt, solis debeantur grammaticis.

Ex antiquissima illa Græcorum lingua duas alias, Doricam et Ionicam, et harum ex Dorica Æolicam, ex Ionica Atticam ortas esse, communis est opinio, nec falsa illa, si recte intelligatur. Proxima enim veterrimæ Græcorum linguæ erat Dorica. Ex hac majore cultu exstitit Æolica, in universum tamen tenacissima antiquitatis. Dorica lingua utebantur etiam Iones, qui quum Athenas tenerent, partemque Asiæ Minoris occupassent, ii, qui in Asia

erant, mitissima cœli temperie invitante, antiquam asperitatem paulatim exuentes, molliore lingua uti cœperunt, alii tamen aliter: hinc quatuor formas linguae Ionum enumerat Herodotus i. 142. Athēnienses autem, quod is populus plurimarum gentium commercio utebatur, ex omnibus pene linguae formis aliquid contrahebat: de qua re disseruit Piersonus ad Mœridem p. 349. Mox quum Iones, qui erant in Asia, poesin et studia literarum colere cœpissent, ab his eruditio migravit Athenas, eaque re factum est, ut Atheniensium sermo, is certe, quo in scribendo utebantur, ad Ionum imitationem conformaretur. Paulo post, quum primatum in Græcia tenerent Athenienses, ad communem usum magis sese accommodarunt scriptores.

Vel e brevissima hac descriptione intelligitur, Græcæ linguae dialectorum tractationem esse difficillimam. Angetur autem hæc difficultas eo, quod non modò ad temporum locorumque diversitatem, sed etiam ad scribendi genus, quo quisque scriptor usus est, respici debet. Ita non idem est, utrum historicus, an orator, an philosophus loquatur. Quamquam in his hoc tamen commodum accidit, quod quisque ejus gentis, ex qua ipse est, lingua, eaque pura, utitur. Quod longe aliter est, ubi ad poetas animum adjece-
ris. Qui quum nulla cujusquam gentis dialecto pura utantur, neque judicari ex illis dialectis, neque ubique idonea pro iis testimonia præbere possunt. Ut breviter dicam, præter illas gentium singularum linguas etiam poeseos generum diversæ dialecti sunt, quas quidem neque solas sine gentium linguis, neque has, neglecta poetarum diversitate, recte tractaveris.

Vetustissima omnium epica poesis est, cujus origo in ea tempora incidit, quibus formari incipiebat dialectus Ionica. Quare qui primi exstiterunt epici carminis auctores, etsi propius accedunt ad eam linguam, quæ postea vocabatur Ionica, plurima tamen habent, quæ Doricus, vel, ut rectius dicam, communis veterum Græcorum sermo usurpabat. Nondum enim penitus apud Iones obmutuerat Dorismus. Præterea iidem poætæ, metri maxime commoditatem spectantes, alia, quæ communis usus jam adspersabatur, conservabant, alia etiam nova introducebant. Ita sermo quidam exstitit proprius poetarum, (poætæ enim omnes erant epici,) qui sermo quum esset Homeri exempli nobilitatus, non licebat epico poætæ alia lingua uti, quam quæ ad Homeri exemplum esset conformata. Sic epica dialectus exstitit, servata illa per omnes ætates, licet paulatim vel ex aliis poeseos generibus, vel e grammaticorum disputationibus, vel denique poetarum negligentia aliquid labis contraheret. Quamobrem epicæ quoque dialecti diversæ formæ sunt, quarum aliquas ipsa Homeri carmina, plures scripta reliquorum continent epicorum. Has igitur formas nisi quis diligenter distinxerit, neque sentire recte de epicis poetis, neque tuto emendationem aggredi poterit.

Epicam poesin consequuta est lyrica, quæ initio modeste ab

epica digrediens, mox, relicto epicorum exemplo, singularum gentium linguis sese applicuit, ita tamen, ut quædam ab epicis, tamquam universæ poeseos communia, derivaret. Nullum est enim genus poeseos, quod non aliquid certe ab epicis acceperit. Ac lyricæ quidem poeseos tres maxime formæ sunt, antiquissima, quæ Ionismum epicorum sectata est, tum Æolica ac Dorica, denique communis quædam. Etenim quum Ionica non sat dignitatis habere videretur, Æolica autem ac Dorica, quod paucarum gentium propriæ essent, apud reliquas gentes nimis peregrinæ haberentur, alia inventa est forma, quæ neque Dorismi granditate careret, neque notam haberet peregrinitatis. Hæc igitur e moderato Dorismi usu et epico sermone conflata est, unde communem vocant grammatici. Ejus illustre exemplum in Pindari carminibus exstat.

Insequuta est tragœdia, quæ in iambis quidem et trochæis Attica lingua utitur, sed ea et veteri et admixtis quibusdam Doricis atque epicis formis; in melicis autem carminibus communem lyricorum orationem sectatur, Dorismo tamen magis temperato, multisque exclusis epicorum licentiis; denique mediam quamdam inter chori et, diverbiorum dialectos rationem usurpat in magna parte anapæstorum.

Comœdia, ut consentaneum erat, communem populi sermonem imitabatur, apud Siculos Doricum, Athenis Atticum. Atque Atticus quidem comicorum sermo quantum a tragico distet, notum est: sed ipse quoque temporum successu aliquantum immutari cœpit, ut non perinde sit, utrum Aristophanem an Menandrum auctorem sequare, quando ne in ipsius quidem Aristophanis fabulis eadem est dictionis ratio. Cæterum etiam apud comicos chori carmina certis conditionibus Dorismum admittunt.

Post illa tempora, quibus apud Athenienses floruerat poesis, quum illa genera, quorum jam exempla exstabant, colebantur, tum alia quædam nova sunt inventa, quæ maxime ex epico et Dorico genere composita sunt. Hæc quoque temperatio leges suas finesque habet, de quibus operæ pretium foret quærere curiosius.

Quæ quum ita sint, facile intelligitur, poeticam dialectum, quam quidam commenti sunt, aut omnino e dialectorum numero tollendam esse, aut, si servanda est ea appellatio, ad illa tantum restringi debere, quæ poetæ omnes communia habent. Hæc vero perpauca sunt. Nec tamen inutile foret, ea omnia colligere, quo clarius perspicui posset, quibus rebus poeticus sermo a prosa oratione diversus fuerit. Apertum est enim, hæc, quæ poetæ in omni genere scribendi, cæteri autem scriptores in nullo usurpant, primariam continere utriusque sermonis differentiam.

Descripsi hæc primis tantum lineis. Nam singula persequi neque possum, nec, si possem, nunc quidem vellem. Illud planum est, has dialectos, quas non immerito poeticas appellaveris, et latius patere illis, quæ in prosa oratione inveniuntur, et plures habere difficultates. Ac latius patent, quia in poetis metrum accedit,

quod ipsum vel pro generibus poeseos, vel pro ætatibus diversas leges habet: difficiliore autem sunt, quod fastidioso quodam temperamento e variis dialectis mixtæ sunt, ut, nisi multam in hoc genere diligentiam adhibueris, proclivis via ad errorem sit. Quo magis adolescentes, qui Græcas literas tractant, monendi sunt, ne putent quidquam adeo leve esse, ut nulla inde percipi posset utilitas. Minutissimæ enim istæ res radices sunt artis, quas qui parvi pendunt, pariter reprehensionem merentur, ut illi, qui in his rebus solis hærent, quem ad finem eæ res tractentur oblitæ. Volo hæc exemplis quibusdam illustrare; eaque talia expromam, ad quæ alios attendisse non noverim.

Æschylus, Sophocles, atque Euripides, quum et in eodem genere scribendi elaboraverint, et ætate pene sint æquales, plurima communia habeant necesse est. Sunt tamen, quibus unusquisque horum ab reliquis discedat: neque solum inter se hi scriptores valde differunt, verum etiam, Sophocles saltem atque Euripides, hæud parum ab se ipsis discrepant. Ut luculento exemplo utar, quanta cum diligentia in quibusdam horum tragædiis versus elaborati sunt, tantam in aliarum versibus fabularum negligentiam invenias. Quod non est casu factum. Nam quum Sophocles atque Euripidis ætate, quum quidem jam diu mortuus esset Æschylus, furiose tragædiis delectarentur Athenienses, orta sunt illa

μειρακύλλια,
τραγωδίας ποιῶντα πλεῖν ἢ μυρία,
Εὐριπίδου πλεῖν ἢ σταδίῳ χαλίστερα¹

qui homines quum non possent non corrumpere artem tragicam, ne meliores quidem poetæ, quoniam istos quoque placere populo animadvertabant, illud studium, illamque diligentiam, qua ante erant usi, retinuerunt. Quæ mutatio facta est Olympiade xc. et xci.¹ Itaque graviter erraret, qui, si quid Sophocles in Philocteta, Euripides in Phœnissis, in Orestæ, in Iphigenia Aulidensi negligenter scripserunt, idem eos sibi indulgere potuisse in Antigona, in Medea, in Heraclidis crederet. Immo criticus, antequam ad harum fabularum emendationem accedet, quo quæque tempore scripta sit, et proinde, quantum in quaque aut studii aut incuriæ ferri possit, investigabit. Patet vero, vicissim e diligentia poetæ vel negligentia ætatem fabulæ elucescere. Sic ante Olympiadem xc. graviter improbatu fuisse tragicus, qui talem versum fecisset:

ὥς πόλυν ἀπῆσθα χρόνον ἐν Αὐλίδος μυχοῖς.

Non possum, quin hic Rhesi mentionem faciam, de cujus fabulæ scriptore diversissimæ exstant doctorum hominum sententiæ.

¹ Vide præfationem meam ad Eurip. Suppl. p. 4. Elem. doctr. metr. ii. 14, 15. p. 123. seq. Elmsleium ad Eurip. Med. p. 70. (55. ed. Lips.) et quæ in adnotationibus ad eum librum dixi, p. 329.

Valckenario, summo viro, non absurda videbatur Delrii suspicio, hanc fabulam ab illo Euripide scriptam esse, qui nobili tragico e fratre nepos erat.¹ Recentioremi esse fabulam his, quas ab Euripide Mnesarchi f. scriptas habemus, non est dubium: quamquam, si trimetros consideres, florentissimis tragicæ artis temporibus factam credas. Neque enim credibile est, quum extrema ætate Euripidis adeo inclinata esset tragœdia, tam bonos versus a suppari poeta esse conditos. Hæc res mirum quantum labefactat opinionem Delrii. Sed hæc ipsa versuum elegantia, si reliqua quoque, quæ in isto carmine singularia sunt, bene perpensa fuissent, monstrare poterant, neque Athenis eam fabulam scriptam esse, nec tam brevi intervallo contingere ætatem Euripidis. Similiter epica poesis, quæ pene jam interierat, feliciter restaurata fuit ab Nonno.

Transeo ad aliam rem. Constat in Græcorum poetarum scriptis versus quosdam reperiri, quorum ultima syllaba, quod sequens versus a vocali incipiat, elidatur. Hæc res natura sua eorum versuum, qui systematis comprehensi sunt, propria est; aliena autem ab his carminibus, quæ κατὰ στίχον composita a grammaticis vocantur. Abhorret igitur ab epica poesi; abhorret ab iambis tragicorum. Apud Homerum tamen ter, nisi fallor, occurrit εὐρύπα Ζῆν' in fine versus positum, quod doctiores grammatici sic scribebant, ut literam ν sequenti versui adderent, falso quidem, quum poetis aliter visum esse aliunde clarum sit. Sed de illo quidem nomine recte sensisse hos puto, qui sine elisione Ζῆν' scribebant. Multa sunt enim nomina, quorum breviores quædam formæ, sive audacia quadam, sive quod antiquitas iis usa esset, a poetis usurpantur, quæ nomina plerumque sedem sibi in extremo versu vindicant. Exempla quædam commemoravit Strabo p. 560. (364.) Certiora elisionis in fine versus exempla in tragicorum trimetris exstant, nullum quidem apud Æschylum, sed unum, si recte memini, in Euripideis fabulis, plura in Sophocleis. Et Sophocles quidem primus hoc facere ausus est, teste Athenæo lib. x. p. 453., cuius locum, quod valde memorabilis est, post aliorum curas emendatum adscribam: ὁ δὲ Ἀθηναῖος Καλλίας (ἐζητοῦμεν γὰρ ἐτι πρότερον περὶ αὐτοῦ) μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν γενόμενος τοῖς χρόνοις Στράτιδος, ἐποίησε τὴν καλουμένην γραμματικὴν θεωρίαν, οὕτω διατάξας· πρόλογος μὲν αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων, ὃν χρὴ λέγειν τὰ τῶν στοιχείων διαιροῦντα κατὰ τὰς παραγραφάς, καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν καταστροφικῶς ποιοῦμένους εἰς τὸ ω·

ἔστ' ἄλφα, βῆτα, γάμμα, δέλτα, θεοῦ, πᾶρ' εἰ,
 ζῆτ'· ἦτα, θῆτ', ἰῶτα, κάππα, λάμβδα, μῦ,
 νῦ, ξῦ, τὸ ον, πῖ, ῥῶ, τὸ σάν, ταῦ, υ παρόν,
 φῖ, χῖ τε, τῷ ψῖ εἰς τὰ ῶ.

¹ Hanc sententiam tueri studuit Boeckhius in libro quem scripsit de Tragicis Græcis p. 228. seqq.

ὁ χορὸς δὲ γυναικῶν ἐκ τῶν σύνδου πεποιημένος αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἑμμετρος
 ζῆμα καὶ μεμελοποιημένος τόνδε τὸν τρόπον· βῆτα ἄλφα, βῆτα εἰ,
 βῆτα ἦτα, βῆτα ἰῶτα, βῆτα ου, βῆτα υ, βῆτα ω; καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἀντι-
 στρόφῳ τοῦ μέλους καὶ τοῦ μέτρου, γάμμα ἄλφα, γάμμα εἰ, γάμμα
 ἦτα, γάμμα ἰῶτα, γάμμα ου, γάμμα υ, γάμμα ω· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν
 συλλαβῶν ὁμοίως ἐκάστων τό τε μέτρον καὶ τὸ μέλος ἐν ἀντιστρόφοις
 ἔχουσι πᾶσαι σαυτὸν· ὥστε τὸν Εὐριπίδην μὴ μόνον ὑπονοεῖσθαι τὴν
 Μήδειαν ἐντεῦθεν πεποιηκέναι πᾶσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μέλος αὐτὸ μετενη-
 νοχότα φανερόν εἶναι· τὸν δὲ Σοφοκλέα διελεῖν φασὶν ἀποτολμῆσαι
 τὸ ποίημα τῷ μέτρῳ, τοῦτ' ἀκούσαντα, καὶ ποιῆσαι ἐν τῷ (Ἰδίῳ) οὕτως·
 ἐγὼ οὐτ' ἐμαυτὸν οὔτε σ' ἀलगυνῶ· τί ταῦτ'
 ἄλλως ἐλέγχεις;

διόπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς ἀντιστρόφους ἀπὸ τούτου παρεδέχοντο πάντες, ὡς
 ἔοικεν, εἰς τὰς τραγῳδίας. καὶ μετὰ τὸν χορὸν εἰσάγει πάλιν ἐκ τῶν
 φωνηέντων βῆσιν, οὕτως, ἣν δεῖ κατὰ τὰς παραγραφὰς ὁμοίως τοῖς
 πρόσθεν λέγονται διαιρεῖν, ἵνα ἡ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ὑπόκρισις σώζηται
 κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν·

Α. ἄλφα μόνον, ὦ γυναῖκες, εἰ τε δεύτερον
 μόνον λέγειν χρή, καὶ τρίτον μόνον γ' ἔρεῖς.

Η. ἦτ' ἄρα φήσω; Α. τό τε τέταρτόν γ' αὖ μόνον
 ἰῶτα· πέμπτον ου· τό θ' ἕκτον υ μόνον
 λέγε. Ω. λοιπὸν δ' ἐγὼ τί φωνῶ σοι; Α. τὸ ω
 τῶν ἐπτά φωνῶν· ἐπτά δ' ἐν μέτροις μόνον,
 καὶ τοῦτο λέξας, εἶτα διὰ σαυτῇ λάλει.

Multos hic locus interpretes frustra exerceuit, in iisque eum
 quoque, qui novissime de fragmentis poetarum ab Athenæo ser-
 vatis mereri studuit in Ephemer. Jenens. a. 1810ccccvi. mensis
 Octobri, fol. 247—251., quæ censura, si recte conjicio, a viro
 juvene scripta est, qui impepso metrorum studio captus, nihil
 prius habuit, quam ubique metra restituere. At in hoc genere
 nemo recte versabitur, antequam tragicos et comicos cognoverit.
 Et quid metra prosunt, si sensum, si dialectos, si grammaticam,
 si prosodiam, si metra denique ipsa leviter cures? Omnino qui
 sat multi nuper eo consilio ad Athenæum convolarunt, ut poeta-
 rum testimonia, quibus is utitur, metris suis restituerent, quæ res
 ut in Athenæi libro non est ultima, ita, ne prima quidem est, vellem
 reputassent, esse in hoc genere multa, quæ emendare non posse
 magis dedecori, quam emendasse laudi esset. Callias iste, non
 diversus fortasse a comico ejus nominis, in fabula illa, quam,
 ut alibi refert Athenæus, grammaticam tragediam nominaverat,
 quum universe τραγικὸν λῆρον, ut Aristophanis verbis utar, tum
 nimium in versibus exæquandis artificium videtur perstringere vo-
 luisse. Eam rem ita instituit, ut mulieres, quibus literarum nomina
 imposuerat, elementa discere faceret. Quam his mulieribus ad-
 ditam fuisse magistram putant interpretes, ea, quantum colligere

licet, harum fuit ipsarum mulierum vel ordine prima, vel natu maxima, quæ Alpha nominabatur. In prologo singulæ mulieres literas omnes eodem modo recitabant, ita ut, quum Alpha, cuius verba adscripsit Athenæus, finem fecisset, subjiceret Beta,

— — — — — εστ' ἄλφα, βῆ-

τα, γάμμα, δέλτα, θεοῦ πάρ' εἰ, ζῆτ', ἦτα, θῆτ',

et quæ sequuntur. Ternæ horum verborum repetitiones undecim plenos versus efficiunt: quo numero octies repetito prologus habebat octoginta et octo trimetros. Illud, ordine hæc ab singulis XXIV. mulieribus pronunciari, indicare videtur Athenæus verbo καταστροφικῶς, quod est *paulatim perveniendo ad exitum*. Male hoc vocabulum, quod vix alibi reperietur, H. Stephanus et qui deinde lexica scripsere, explicuerunt. Similis lusus, ut in prologo, etiam in colloquio Vocalium est. Ibī unaquæque Vocalis jubetur eam literam solam, a qua nomen habeat, pronunciare, ita ut hæc recitatio septem versibus absolvatur. Hujus carminis primus versus talis erat,

α, εἰ, η, ι, ον, υ, ω, α, εἰ, η, ι, ον.

Et griphus (nam de griphis disserens hæc scribit Athenæus) in eo positus est, quod, si singulæ vocales ordine pronunciantur, non ante vocalis ω, quæ ultima est, in finem versus incidit, quam in versu septimo, i. e. omnibus vocalibus duodecies repetitis. In his septem versibus hoc quoque notabile est, quod nullus pes eidem pedi in reliquis versibus similis est, et quotumcumque pedem per omnes septem versus consideres, in eo omnes septem vocales bis scriptæ reperiuntur. In ista recitatione cur dicat Athenæus distinguendas esse personas, ἵνα ἡ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ὑπόκρισις σώζεται κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, nunc clarum est. Nam etsi plerumque facile est, in recitandis colloquiis, si παραγραφὰι, i. e. notæ personarum, adscriptæ sunt, distinguere personas, est tamen hoc difficillimum, ubi singulæ personæ singulas syllabas pronunciant. Quare quod dicit Athenæus κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, quod aliter inepte addidisset, necessario adjiciendum erat. Obiter observamus, quæ Alpha, magistra, apud Calliam de ista recitatione præcipiens dicit, καὶ τοῦτο λέξας, εἶτα δὴ σαντῇ λάλει, his verbis moneri mulieres, ut peracta recitatione secum recōrdentur quæ didicerint. Nam εἰσαντῷ λαλεῖν de iis dicitur, qui secum aliquid reputant, ut apud Lucianum in Scythia. 6. t. i. p. 866.

Progredior nunc ad chorum, qui erat in Calliæ fabula. Qui chorus non potuit, ut quibusdam visum est, βῆτ' ἄλφα βα, βῆτ' εἰ βε, et sic reliqua, canere. Nam ne quid dicam de turpissimis versibus, qui ex his vocibus prodeunt, quomodo tandem, quod factum testatur Athenæus, omnes strophæ eodem metro fuissent, quum literæ ζ, ξ, ψ produci postulent syllabas, quas reliquæ corripī jubent? Una tantum ratio erat, qua metra ubique exæquari

poterant, si vocales sono, non nominibus, indicarentur, veluti βῆρ' α βα, βῆρ' εἰ βει. * Sed sic quoque versus exstitissent turpissimi, neque Athenæus bis dixisset idem esse metrum in strophis omnibus, si id sponte patuisset. Accedit quod syllabæ βα, βε, et reliquæ in primæ tantum strophæ expositione adjēctæ sunt, non etiam in secundæ. Quare has syllabas ab librario aliquo in margine adscriptas puto, quo is rationem, qua personæ consociatæ erant, quam brevissime indicaret. Quod satis erat in prima strophæ fecisse. Ab imperitis deinde hæ syllabæ insertæ sunt verbis Athenæi. Callias ita personas conjunxerat, ut singulas strophas singulæ Consonantes totas canerent, accinentibus ordine singulis Vocalibus. Veluti si strophæ e septem versibus constabant, primam stropham totam canebat Beta, in primo autem versu accinebat Alpha, in secundo E, et sic in singulis versibus reliquæ Vocals. Hanc rationem imitatus erat in Medea Euripides: de quo quæ hic scribit Athenæus, alio ejusdem scriptoris loco illustrantur, qui est in principio libri septimi, ubi hæc refert de Clearcho: καὶ γὰρ Καλλιᾶν ἱστορεῖ τὸν Ἀθηναῖον γραμματικὴν συνθεῖναι τραγῳδίαν, ἀφ' ἧς ποιῆσαι τὰ μέλη καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν Εὐριπίδην ἐν Μηδείᾳ, καὶ Σοφοκλέα τὸν Οἰδίπουν. Utrumque Athenæi locum consideranti non potest dubium esse, de solis choris agi, qui quod primaria tragœdiæ pars habebantur, τὴν Μήδειαν πᾶσαν dicere potuit Athenæus. In his choris μέλη, de quibus judicari nunc non potest, et διάθεσιν, quæ est personarum descriptio, a Callia Euripides sumserat. Ea personarum descriptio, si fides est Athenæo, in omnibus chori carminibus, quæ sunt in Medea, ad Calliæ exemplum facta esse debuit. Quod quidem fieri potuisse non negabit, qui Euripidem choros in universum quidem ad Calliæ rationem, sed, uti decebat, aliis in locis aliter conformasse sibi persuaserit. Quamquam in singulis locis hanc imitationem aperire difficile est. Unum tamen in Medea carmen est chori, quod non solum percommode ad Calliæ exemplum constitui potest, sed etiam ista personarum descriptione multo fit præstabilius, quum personis ita per vices ista dicentibus majus chori studium, majorque motus declaretur. Stropham, quæ est a v. 149. adscribam.

BA. Ἀἴες, ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ γὰ καὶ φῶς,
ἰαχάν, οἷαν δ' δύστανος
μέλπει νύμφα;

BE. τίς σοί ποτε τὰς ἀπλίστου
κοίτας ἔρος, ὦ ματαία,
σπεύσει θανάτου τελευτάν;
μηδὲν τόδε λίσσου.

BH. εἰ δὲ σὺς πόσις
καινᾷ λέχη σεβίζει,
κείνῳ τόδε μὴ χαράσσον.

BI. Ζεὺς σοι τάδε συνδικάσει.
μὴ λίαν τάκου,
δυρομένα σὸν εὐνίταν.

Indicavi personas iisdem literis, quibus Callias usus fuerat. Ut haec stropham totam canit Beta, accinentibus ordine Alpha, E, Eta, et Iota, ita iisdem accinentibus antistropham totam canit Gamma. Illud sponte intelligitur, incertum esse, utrum singulis literis apud Euripidem singulae personae, an plures conjunctae significentur. Obiter moneo, quod circa finem antistrophae est, *φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὖδα*, in quibus verbis quum *φίλα* singularis numeri esse putaretur, critici versum strophicum sollicitarunt, hunc sensum habere: *hic etiam, bene ei nos velle*.

Postquam de Medea Euripidis dixerat Athenæus, obiter, turbato narrationis ordine, qui mos est hujus scriptoris, Sophoclis facit mentionem, quem dicit, quum audivisset Euripidem aliquid e Calliae fabula hausisse, in Œdipo, sibi idem licere ratum, alia ratione Calliam esse imitatum, et vocabulum in fine versus divisisse. Fecit hoc Sophocles, ut censebat Clearchus, ad imitationem prologi qui erat in Calliae fabula: in quo prologo verba sic dividi supra ostendimus. Statim deinde Athenæus ad antistrophas redit his verbis: *διόπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς ἀντιστροφὰς ἀπὸ τοῦτον* (i. e. ex eo tempore) *παρεδέχοντο πάντες, ὡς ἔοικεν, εἰς τὰς τραγῳδίας*. Ex his verbis colligimus, tragicos, quum ante editam Euripidis Medeam hic illic parcius usi essent antistrophis, posteaquam ille novam earum rationem et liberio rem prodidisset, ibi quoque antistrophas adhibuisse, ubi ante usus earum fuerat incommodus. Non sum nescius, quantae dubitationes hanc Athenæi narrationem premant; sed de his non ante poterit recte explicari, quam quum majores progressus fecerit tragicorum emendatio, quæ nulla in parte magis, quam in hac, jacet.

Redeo nunc ad elisam in fine trimetri syllabam. Eam igitur elisionem, Athenæo auctore, abjudicare debemus ab omnibus tragicorum fabulis, quæ ante Sophoclis Œdipum editæ sunt. Nec tamen hoc satis est. Nam nec Sophocles, neque qui cum sequuti sunt tragici, ubique, ut equidem puto, sed certa quadam conditione, istam elisionem admiserunt. Ostendent hoc exempla, quæ hæc sunt: in Œdipo Rege v. 29.

ὑφ' οὗ κενούται δῶμα Καδμείων, μέλας δ'

Ἄιδης στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται.

v. 332.

*ἐγὼ οὐτ' ἐμavτὸν, οὔτε σ' ἀλγυνῶ. τί ταῦτ'
ἄλλως ἐλέγχεις;*

v. 785.

*κάγὼ τὰ μὲν κελνοῖν ἑτερπύμην· ὅμως δ'
ἔκνιζέ μ' αἰεὶ τοῦθ'· ὑφείρπε γὰρ πολὺ.*

v. 1184.

*ὅστις πέφασμαι φύς τ' ἀφ' ὧν οὐ· χρῆν, ξὺν οἷς τ'
οὐ χρῆν μ' ὁμιλῶν, οὗς τέ μ' οὐκ ἔδει κτανῶν.*

v. 1224.

*οἷ' ἔργ' ἀκούσεσθ', οἷα δ' εἰσύψεσθ', ὅσον δ'
ἀρεῖσθε πένθος.*

In Electra v. 1017.

ἀπροσδόκητον οὐδὲν εἶρηκας· καλῶς δ'
ἤδη σ' ἀπορρίψουσιν ἀπηγγελλόμην.

In Œdipo Coloneo v. 16.

χωρὸς δ' ὅδ' ἱρός, ὡς σάψ' εἰκάσαι, βρώων
δάφνης, ἐλαίας, ἀμπέλων· πυκνότεροι δ'
ἔσω κατ' αὐτὸν εὐστομοῦσ' ἀηδόνες.

v. 1164.

σοὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν μολόντ'
αἰτεῖν, ἀπελθεῖν τ' ἀσφαλῶς τῆς δεῦρ' ὁδοῦ.

Denique in Iphig. Taur. v. 968.

ὡς δ' εἰς Ἄρειον ὄχθον ἤκον, ἐς δίκην τ'
ἔστην.

Ex his locis, si ab uno discesseris, hac tantum conditione syllabam in fine trimetri elidi discimus, si proxime prægressa sit interpunctio, quæ quod pausam in pronunciando fieri jubet, ea, quæ deinde sequuntur, arctius conjungi postulat. Nani Græcos neque solius metri rationem in recitandis versibus habuisse, neque, ut nostrum multi solent, quum versus legunt, metrum neglexisse, reconditis quibusdam, sed certis argumentis possumus colligere. Ex quo genere illud est, quod de longa syllaba, qua interdum vox ante arsin quinti pedis trimetrorum finitur, in præfatione ad Orphica scripsi. Alia hujusmodi, quæ addere possem, omitto. Quod si quis versus illos, quos adscripsimus, recte pronunciare sciat, is intelligat necesse est, elisiones istas in extremis versibus non modo esse duras, sed aliquid etiam habere suavitatis. Unus tamen in his locus est, qui quum nullam ab interpunctione habeat excusationem, de vitio suspectus est.

σοὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν μολόντ'
αἰτεῖν.

Vauvillersius, probante, ut videtur, Wytenbachio, in Bibl. Crit. ii. 2, 51. μολόντ' in μόνον mutabat. Agnoscit tamen hoc participium scholiastes, ita scribens: τὸ ἐξῆς, φασὶν αὐτὸν μολόντα αἰτεῖν εἰς λόγους σοὶ ἐλθεῖν. Equidem non credo dividere Sophoclem vocabulum voluisse, quum scribere posset,

σοὶ φασὶν ἐλθόντ' αὐτὸν ἐς λόγους μολεῖν
αἰτεῖν,

vel,

σοὶ φασὶν ἐλθεῖν ἐς λόγους μολόντα νιν
αἰτεῖν.

Prior ratio defendi potest eo, quod sæpius error in terminationibus similium vel oppositorum admissus invenitur. Ac similis locutio in eadem Sophoclis fabula est v. 1297.

οὐτ' εἰς ἐλεγχον χειρὸς οὗτ' ἔργον μολών.

Alteram tamen rationem prætulcrim, tum quod scholiastes infiniti-

vum ἐλθεῖν pariter ac participium μολόντα tuetur, tum quod non rari sunt errores, quos αὐτὸν pro νῦν repositum peperit.¹

Sed hæc hactenus. Indicenda est enim sollemnis doctorem philosophiæ creatio, quæ hoc quidem anno cum jucundissima conjuncta est gratulatione, qua duo nobis prosequendi sunt eximii viri, quos ex iis, qui ante hos L. annos artium magistri ab Ordine nostro creati sunt, superstites esse gaudemus,

GEORGIUS STEPHANUS WIESAND

POTENTISSIMO REGI SAXONIÆ A CONSILIIS PROVOCATIONUM, FACULTATIS JURIDICÆ IN ACADEMIA VITEBERGENSI ORDINARIUS

et

CHRISTIANUS GOTTLOB HEYNE

POTENTISSIMO BRITANNIÆ REGI AB SECRETIS REI JUDICIARIÆ CONSILIIS, ELOQUENTIÆ ET POESEOS PROFESSOR IN ACADEMIA GEORGIA AUGUSTA,

quibus viris, qui meritis adeptam nominis claritatem etiam senes indefesso studio, quo civibus suis ac literis prosunt, tuentur, diuturnos contingere optamus hilaris senectutis fructus. Utinam hoc voto etiam Fridericum Volgangum Reizium possemus comprehendere, qui eodem anno cum his artium magister factus, jam diu ex vivis abiit, indelebili nobis, atque ante alios mihi, relicto desiderio. Die igitur XII. Febr. h. x. in Auditorio majore anniversaria instituetur solemnitas, in qua primo ii, qui jam tabulis publice propositis Philosophiæ Doctores ac Liberalium Artium Magistri declarati sunt, renunciabuntur :

LIBORIUS DE BERGMANN

PASTOR PRIMARIUS ECCLESIAE RIGENSIS, AD AED. D. PETRI RIGÆ PASTOR, CONSISTORII ASSESSOR, COLLEGII UTRIUSQUE, ET QUOD SCHOLASTICAS, ET QUOD PAUPERUM RES CURAT, COLLEGA.

FRIDERICUS ADOLPHUS KRETSCHMANN

LIPSIENSIS

JUR. UTR. BACCAL. ET NOT. PUBL.

CHRISTIANUS GUILIELMUS WIESAND

VITEBERGENSIS

JUR. UTR. BACCAL. ET CAUSSAR. PATRONUS SAX.

Antiquo deinde ritu creabuntur hi :

¹ Vide Elem. d. metr. i. 8, 10. p. 36.

JOANNES FRIDERICUS AUGUSTUS SEIDLER

OSTERFELDA MISN.

EDUARDUS PLATNER

LIPSIENSIS

JUR. UTR. BACCAL.

CHRISTIANUS GODOFREDUS SCHMIDT

SCHOENFELDIA MISN.

GEORGIUS GUILIELMUS ROSSTÆUSCHER

SCHLEUSNGA FRANCUS

REV. MIN. CAND.

HENRICUS THEOPHILUS KREUSSLER

LIPSIENSIS

JOANNES TRAUGOTT TRABERT

CÖLLEDA THURINGUS

CAROLUS FRIDERICUS ADLER

MÜCKERNA MISN.

Hanc ergo solemnitatem ut VOS, MAGNIFICE RECTOR, CE-
LISSIME PRINCEPS SCHOENBURGICE, ILLUSTRISSIMI
COMITES, GRAVISSIMI PROCERES ac FAUTORES ACA-
DEMIÆ, GENEROSISSIMI denique atque HUMANISSIMI
COMMILITONES, præsentia VESTRA ornare celebrioremque
reddere velitis, Ordinis, meo, candidatorumque nomine, qua
debet observantia a VOBIS peto. P. P. in Universitate Litera-
rum Lipsiensi Dominica Estomili a. 1815ccccvii.

NUGÆ.

No. XXIII.—[Continued from No. LXXV.]

1. *Translation of a Greek Epitaph by FR. THIERSCH in the
xlvth Number of the Classical Journal.*

In Rhigam et Socios cum ipso interemtos.

RHIGAS, unus e cordatissimis hodiernæ Græciæ juvenibus,
(vigente adhuc Gallorum potentia) Parisiis degens cum sociis,
consilium liberandæ patriæ ceperat. Rebus, uti voluerat,
præparatis, ipse a Gallorum principibus, ut ferunt, ad mag-
nam spem elatus, reditum in Græciam molitus est; sed fama
ejus consiliorum jam exierat. Itaque in itinere per Aus-

triam correptus Turcisque ad supplicium cum comitibus suis traditus est.

Οὔτοι ἐλευθερίην θηρώμενοι ἀγλαόμορφον,
 εὔρον ἐνὶ ξυλόχοις ὀκρυόεντα μόρον.
 χαίρετε, θηρευταὶ κοιμώμενοι, εἰσόκεν Ἡῶς
 ἔλθῃ, ἀπ' Οὐλύμπου λαμπὰδ' ἀνισχομένη.
 καὶ τότε γειρόμενοι πολλῶν βρόμῳ ὄρνυμενάων,
 δαίμονες εἰς ἄγραν σπεύδ' ἀλεξίκακοι.

Here rests a band of valiant youths, who late
 Following through Grecian woods a glorious game,
 Hunters of Freedom, 'mid those treacherous wilds
 Untimely fell. Sleep in your moss-grown tombs,
 Brave hunters! sleep, nor let impatient dreams
 Of hope disturb your rest: the cheerful morn
 Is nigh, when ye, awaken'd by the shouts
 Of the reviving nations, shall arise
 Bright genii, guardians of the woods, to lead
 The chase ye loved of old—not then in vain!

The inscription, of which the above is a free paraphrase, was written some time before the breaking out of the Greek revolution: the writer, if we mistake not, is no other than the excellent author of the Homeric Greek Grammar. For a more ample account of Rhigas, see M. Fauriel's "*Chants Populaires de la Grèce Moderne*," tom. ii. p. 15 sqq.; where a specimen of his poetry is likewise given.

II. Review of Elmsley's *Bacchæ*, *Class. Journ.* No. XLVI. p. 405. "V. 5. Πάρεμι Δίρκης νάματ' Ἰσμηνοῦ θ' ὕδαρ. The construction *πάρεμι νάματα* is rare. Mr. E. quotes Cycl. 95. Πόθεν πάρεισι Σικελὸν Αἰτναῖον πάγην. 106. Πόθεν Σικελίαν τήνδε ναυστολῶν πάρει; neither example is in point. In the latter, *Σικελίαν ναυστολῶν* is 'used like *ναυστολεῖν χθόνα* in Med. 682. and Hipp. 36; and in the former, Euripides, doubtless, wrote *Πόθεν πάρεισ' εἰς Σικελόν*.—The passage in the *Bacchæ* is corrupt."

We are inclined to agree with the learned and ingenious critic in his explanation of Cycl. 95; to which we may add, by the way, that *πόθεν* is to be construed with *ναυστολῶν*, and not with *πάρει*. His emendation of v. 106. appears more doubtful. In a former number of the *Nugæ* (*Class. Journ.* No. LXX.) we have shown, that *πάρεμι* in narratives usually bears the signification of "I am come," or more strictly, "I am here, having come." Is it not possible that, as has happened in other instances, the meaning of the word may have affected its construction, inasmuch that,

being habitually considered as a verb of motion, it is made, like other verbs of motion, to govern an accusative?

III. Thucyd. vi. 27. ad fin. speaking of the mutilation of the Hermæ: καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα μειζρόνως ἐλάμβανον (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι)· τοῦ τε γὰρ ἐκπλου οἰωνὸς ἐδόκει εἶναι, καὶ ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ ἅμα νεωτέρων πραγμάτων καὶ δήμου καταλύσεως γεγενῆσθαι. So also c. 61, in reference to the mock celebration of the mysteries: καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ τῶν Ἑρμῶν ὄνοντο σαφῶς ἔχειν, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τὰ μυστικά, ὧν ἐπαίτιος ἦν, μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ξυνωμοσίας ἐπὶ τῷ δήμῳ ὑπ' ἐκείνου ἐδόκει πραχθῆναι.

There is (as it appears to us) a difficulty in these passages, of which none of the commentators has even attempted a solution. Where was the connexion between the mutilation of the Hermæ and the overthrow of the Athenian democracy? or what could lead the people to suppose that the one was intended as preparatory to the other? Thucydides, indeed, speaking of the arguments adduced by the political enemies of Alcibiades in proof of his guilt, says, c. 28 ad fin. ἐβόων, ὥς ἐπὶ δήμου καταλύσει τὰ τε μυστικά καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἑρμῶν περικοπὴ γένοιτο, καὶ οὐδὲν εἴη αὐτῶν ὅ τι οὐ μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη· ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. And had he said no more, than that Alcibiades was suspected of a design against the state, the latter reason would have appeared sufficient ground for such a suspicion; we should have imagined that it was merely in connexion with his former conduct, and partly as symptomatic of evil designs, partly as the first step in the career of revolution, that these acts were regarded as matters of jealousy; inasmuch as he who scrupled not to insult the symbols of the established religion, and profane its most holy mysteries, would as little hesitate to attempt the subversion of the laws which were consecrated by that religion, and founded on it as their support; to which connexion we find continual references in the writers of Athens. But the remarkable expression, ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ νεωτέρων πραγμάτων; appears to imply something more than this. It seems to indicate that the outrages in question were not merely regarded as *signs* of the existence of a revolutionary spirit; but as part of the conspiracy itself, and as an integral act of no small importance. We know not what weight may be due to our conjecture on this subject; it is as follows. In all combinations, for whatever purpose, mutual fidelity is confessedly of primary importance; and where, as in the case before us, the lives and fortunes of the parties concerned are at stake, it is necessary that some stronger motive

should be devised, by which they may be bound indissolubly to the common cause. Hence it has been a favorite policy with the leaders of conspiracies in all ages, to render their associates objects of public suspicion, or compromise them, if possible, with the existing laws, in order that their sole chance of personal safety may lie in the success of the undertaking; on the principle alluded to by Thucydides, iii. 82. τὰς ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς πλῆτεις οὐ τῷ θεῷ νόμῳ μᾶλλον¹ ἐκρατύοντο, ἢ τῷ κοινῇ τι παρανομῆσαι. Instances of this stratagem may be found in most histories, ancient and modern. Nor could any thing be better chosen in this view than the defacement of the Mercuries, and the profanation of the Eleusinian mysteries. Such acts of daring impiety appear, indeed, to have been frequently perpetrated on similar occasions; forming at once a kind of unhallowed pledge of fidelity, and a means to secure it. And when we remember the severity with which even minor offences against the public religion were visited, at Athens as elsewhere, as well as the peculiar sanctity which attached to the Eleusinian rites, it is easy to imagine in what light such proceedings must have been regarded by an Athenian. That the people should have connected with them the notion of a political conspiracy is natural enough, if, as we suppose, the combination of the two was familiar to their minds.

IV. Hom. Od. xi. 568. ed. Wolf.

Ἐνθ' ἦτοι Μίνωα ἴδον, Διὸς ἀγλαὸν υἱὸν,
 χρύσειον σκήπτρον ἔχοντα, θεμιστεύοντα νέκυσιν,²
 ἥμενον· οἱ δέ μιν ἀμφὶ δίκας εἴροντο ἄνακτα,
 ἥμενοι, ἐσταότες τε, κατ' εὐρυπυλῆς Ἀΐδος δῶ.

These lines are commonly understood, as if it was the office of Minos to institute an examination into the previous lives and actions of the shades summoned before his tribunal, and to allot them different abodes in Hades, according to the corresponding passage in Virgil, *Æn.* vi. 432. *Quæsitur Minos urnam movet: ille silentum Conciliumque vocat, vitasque et crimina discit.* Thus Eustathius: Ὅτι προθέμενος Ὀμηρος εἰπεῖν καὶ περὶ τινων ἐν ᾧδου μὲν κολαζομένων, ἄλλως δὲ ὅτε ἐβίουιν εὐ ἐχόντων ὡς ἐν τρυφαῖς,

¹ Οὐ μᾶλλον here is evidently "not so much." See Nugæ, No. XVIII. *Class. Journ.* LXX.

² The old reading, νεκύεσσιν, has occasioned some trouble to metrical critics. Our conjecture is, that the two latter words of the line originally belonged to a different verse, and a different construction—θεμιστεύων νεκύεσσιν; and that the sense of the passage was subsequently altered by some careless rhapsode, leaving the metre to shift for itself.

ὁποῖος ὁ Τιτυδὲς καὶ ὁ Τάνταλος καὶ ὁ Σίσυφος, πρὸ γε τέως αὐτῶν λέγει περὶ δικαστηρίου τοῦ δικαιούντος τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ᾧδου κόλασιν, οὐπάρ ὁ Μίνως προκαθῆται. And it is remarkable that Pope, writing under the guidance of this idea, has contrived to produce a translation, of which scarcely one word is warranted by his original.

High on a throne, tremendous to behold,
Stern Minos waves a mace of burnish'd gold :
Around ten thousand thousand spectres stand,
Through the wide dome of Dis, a trembling band :
Still as they plead, the fatal lots he rolls,
Absolves the just, and dooms the guilty souls.

The "high throne," though superfluous, and not in Homer, may perhaps be allowed to pass ; but the epithets "stern" and "tremendous to behold," which, though more appropriate to a civil than to a criminal judge, might in either case be well spared, since Homer has spared them ; the English judicial *mace*, substituted for the Grecian kingly *σκῆπτρον* ; the *burnish'd gold* ; the Miltonic *ten thousand thousand spectres* ; *wide*, for the expressive wide-gated ; the *trembling band* ; the *lots*, and the whole of the last line, borrowed from Dryden's Virgil, are unwarranted either by the words or the spirit of the original ; while, on the other hand, the dramatic *ἐνθ' ἦτοι* — ἴδον, the *Διὸς ἀγλαὸν υἶδν*, connecting Minos with the other departed heroes, and the picturesque *ἡμεῖοι ἐσταότες τε*, are all passed over in silence. It is difficult to imagine that the author of the preceding and of the following translation drew from the same original.

There saw I Minos, offspring famed of Jove ;
His golden sceptre in his hand, he sat,
Judge of the dead ; they, pleading each in turn
His cause, some stood, some sat, filling the house
Whose spacious folding-gates are never closed.

Cowper.

Even this, however, is slightly tinctured with the prevailing notion ; since "pleading each his cause" is very different from "pleading causes," *δίκας εἰρηντο*. To return, however, from this digression ; our opinion is, that Minos is not here described as a judge of the deeds of men while on earth, and as allotting eternal happiness or misery to departed souls ; but simply as a *civil* judge, appointed to decide such differences as might arise among the dead themselves. We are aware that to many, if not to all our readers, this explanation will appear at first sight paradoxical, or even absurd. We proceed, therefore, to give our reasons for preferring it to the one commonly re-

ceived; premising, that although the passage in which these lines occur is undoubtedly an interpolation, it is, we think, not so far removed in age from the more ancient parts of the *Odyssey*, but that arguments drawn from those parts may lawfully be employed in illustrating it, as far at least as the present subject is concerned.

In the first place, then, there is nothing in the verses themselves inconsistent with the proposed explanation; nothing, in fact, which does not naturally lead to it, at least in the eyes of an unbiassed reader. For it is to be remembered, that we come to the perusal of this passage with minds prepossessed in favor of the common notion; we have been taught by the Attic and Roman writers, as well as by modern commentators and archæologists, to regard the criminal judicature of Minos as one of the most undisputed and indisputable articles of the mythological creed; and accordingly, when we meet with the name of Minos and the words *θεμιστεύοντα νεκύεσσιν* in the same sentence, we are apt to interpret them in this sense. But let the reader dismiss this preconception from his mind; let him suppose, for argument's sake, that the office of infernal judge, as commonly understood, never formed a part of popular belief, nor is any where mentioned in subsequent writers; let him, under this impression, read the passage now before us: in what sense, we ask, is he likely to understand it? Is it not natural to suppose that he will interpret *θεμιστεύειν* as he has been accustomed to interpret it on all other occasions, "administering justice" to the dead, in the same manner as, if he were to meet with a description of Agamemnon or Menelaus, *θεμιστεύειν Λαλαῶσιν*, he would translate it "administering justice to the Greeks?" And would it ever enter his mind that *δίκαι* meant any thing more than the private controversies that arose among the people of the shades? If then this be the meaning which an unbiassed reader would inevitably affix to the passage, and there be nothing in the words to suggest any other meaning, are we not warranted in concluding that no other meaning was intended by the author? Had any thing so momentous as the final destiny of human souls been in the poet's mind, we may be sure that he would not have slurred it over with such vague expressions as *θεμιστεύοντα* and *δίκας εἰποντο*.—So also with regard to the moral coloring of the passage. The scene presented to us is exceedingly distinct and picturesque, but of no peculiar solemnity, or deep interest, save what necessarily belongs to every thing connected with the dead. We see, through the twilight gloom, the great house of Hades with its wide gates ex-

panded, and within them a multitude of apparitions, some standing, others seated; in the midst a kingly form, such as kings were in the heroic ages, seated, with a staff of gold in his hand, listening to their pleadings, and giving judgment. And this is all: there is no inexorable sternness in the features of the judge—no attendant furies—no alternations of hope and fear—no lamentations or vain strugglings—no triumph or despair. It is impossible to imagine but that something, at least, of all this would have been visible, had the judgment which the poet describes been one so important in its issues as the ordinary supposition implies.

2. It was for his uprightness in the capacity of judge on earth that Minos was selected to fill the same office in Hades; it follows, therefore, that the nature of his employment was the same in the lower world as in the upper. Now it seems to admit of doubt whether the office of criminal judge was known in the heroic times; whether, in fact, the power of life and death was not exclusively vested in the λαός or assembled people. If this were the case, it would seem to follow that the jurisdiction of Minos was, in modern phraseology, altogether civil. Viewed in this light, the conception is a characteristic one, and such as would naturally occur to a people imbued with the early Grecian ideas of a future state. We lay comparatively little stress, however, on this argument, as the fact on which it is grounded may admit of question, and the inference may not be obvious to all.

3. There are no traces of the notion of a future judgment in any part of the Homeric writings. We use the word judgment, as distinguished from retribution, because the latter is explicitly indicated in the *Iliad*, xix. 259. 'Εριννύες, αἵθ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν Ἀνθρώπους τίννυνται, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση' although in the *Odyssey*, and especially in the eleventh and twenty-fourth books (excepting only those passages which are manifestly spurious¹) the contrary belief is implied. Of two of the individuals, moreover, to whom later fables have assigned this arduous function, repeated mention is made; Minos is described as king of Cnossus, and Διδὸς μεγάλου βασιστής; and Rhadamanthus as presiding over the happy Elysian plain, represented by subsequent poets as the abode of the righteous; *Od.* xix. 178. iv. 562 sqq. and other places, to which we need not refer; but no where is there any allusion to their supposed judicial capacity.

¹ If it be said that the lines relative to Minos form part of the interpolation alluded to, we answer, that they are not necessarily by the same author as those on Tantalus, Sisyphus, &c.; and that, even if it were so, it would not follow that Minos was a criminal judge.

4. To our conceptions there is something strange, and almost ludicrous, in the idea of disputes and arbitrations among the dead. We are wont to conceive of the old mythological Hades as it was modified by after writers, Virgil for instance, from whom our earliest notions on this subject are commonly derived, and who, writing in the full sun-shine of Grecian philosophy, has certainly imparted to the material conceptions of his predecessor a refined and spiritual character which does not in strictness belong to them. To this must be added the habitual influence of Christian ideas, influencing insensibly even our recollections of Paganism. But the Hades of the *Odyssey* is of a very different description. It is neither Platonic, nor Pindaric, nor Virgilian, nor Miltonian. It is merely a kind of appendix to the living world; an unsubstantial state indeed, and one of no great enjoyment, but in all other respects bearing a close resemblance to it—a cold and shadowy reflection of this life. Homer's ghosts are as earthly as his gods. They pass into Hades, not indeed so insensibly as the souls of Swedenborg, who, as he informs us, sometimes remain days and weeks together in the spiritual world without discovering their change of situation; but with all their humanities about them, their partialities, passions, and even appetites; there is a community, and distinctions of rank, (v. 484.) a house of Hades, &c. Among such a set of beings the occurrence of disputes, and the want of an arbitrator to decide them, are as conceivable as among the palpable visions of the Swedish seer.

Sed manum de tabula. It may perhaps be thought that we have expended a good deal of discussion on an unimportant point; especially as the passage in question is confessedly of later date than (what are called) the genuine parts of the *Odyssey*. We think, however, that the matter was worth determining; at any rate, our remarks may serve to amuse the reader.

Our readers will not, perhaps, quarrel with us for concluding these dry discussions with the following very pleasing stanzas from a modern poet, containing a happy allusion to a notion which appears to have been in some degree common to the Homeric times and those of the Old Testament. (Il. xiii. 71. ἵχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἡδὲ κνημῶν 'Ρεῖ ἔγνω ἀπίόντος, ἀγλυνωτοὶ δὲ θεοὶ περ' so Virgil, *Æn.* i. 402. Dixit, et avertens rosea cervice refulsit, &c. Compare Judges xiii.)

• We allude to their drinking the sacrificial blood.

O'er hill, and dale, and distant sea,
Through all the miles that stretch between,
My thought must fly to rest on thee,
And would, though worlds should intervene.

Nay, thou art now so dear, methinks,
The farther we are forced apart,
Affection's firm elastic links
But bind the closer round the heart.

For now we sever each from each,
I know what I have lost in thee;
Alas, that nothing less could teach,
How great indeed my love should be!

Farewell! I did not know thy worth;
But thou art gone, and now 'tis prized:
So angels walk'd unknown on earth,
But when they flew were recognised!

ΒΟΛΗΤΟΣ.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

XENOPHON'S ANABASIS.

THE *Classical Journal* cannot be an improper channel respecting hypotheses and annotations in connexion with the classics. I may have had forerunners in the observation I wish to make; but I am not aware that any, even among the learned commentators and sagacious interpreters that adorn the present age, have noticed the strange blunder that I wish, with deference, to point out.

The error to which I allude, appears in a lengthy note on lib. i. cap. 2. § 9. of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which occupies several columns in the edition Lipsiæ, Schneider, 1815; and is copied verbatim, without further comment, in Townsend's edit. 1823. Hutchinson is very laconic on the subject, and says nothing to make the matter clearer. It seems to me strange that so many quick-sighted annotators, in collecting the several sums of the forces under Cyrus's generals, to compare their amount with Xenophon's total, should pass without a syllable, without a glance, the 1000 ὀπλῖται and 500 πελτασταὶ under MENO (recorded in sect. 6.); who with his men cuts no unimportant figure in the subsequent history. Adding these sums to the others given in the text of the Lipsiæ and Townsend's edit., we have as follows:—

	Xenias	4000	ὀπλίται	
	Proxenus	1500		+ 500 γύμνηται
(Stymph.)	Sophanet.	1000		
	Socrates	500		
	Pasio	300		+ 300 πελτασταί
	MENO	1000		+ 500
	Cléarchus	1000		+ { 800
	Sosias	1000		+ { 200 τοξόται
(Arcas)	Sophanet.	1000		
	Total, ὀπλίται	11,300		From 2300 take 200
				Total, 2100 πελτασταί or γύμνηται, as posed to ὀπλίται.

Now I humbly suggest that it may be allowable to deduct the 200 τοξόται, because they are a third sort (or denomination) mentioned only with Cléarchus, the other στρατηγοὶ having only two sorts, i. e. ὀπλίται and πελτασταί or γύμνηται; and because Xenophon himself may by a very accountable oversight, or perhaps even purposely, have omitted them in his summation of the muster. The above reckoning of ὀπλίται is 300 too much, but is decidedly better than the 1000 too little of the Lipsiæ and Townsend edit. So also 2300 is a better approximation to ἀμφὶ τοὺς δισχιλίους than 1500.

But now observe, that if we add *Meno's* armament to the sums as given in the prolix note, with Pasio's and Sosias' amounts corrected; i. e. add 1000 ὀπλίται to 10,000, and 500 πελτασταί to 1500, we then gain the *exact* sums mentioned in round numbers by Xenophon. Which of these two methods of enumerating the forces and explaining Cyrus's muster-roll may have the vantage ground, an humble individual like myself, who have "small Latin and less Greek," is incompetent to decide.

At any rate, the accession of *Meno's* forces helps the computation; and it is unaccountable how they came to be banished from the eyes of the quick-sighted erudite annotators that have speculated with such prolixity and apparent minuteness on the subject.

I do not know whether they intend the reference given at the end of their remarks to assist themselves and their readers, or to involve them with slighter hopes of release in the labyrinth into which they have led them. It seems to me to have the latter effect; for when to the 11,000 here mentioned we add the 700 brought by Chirisophus (vide cap. 4. § 3.) and the 400 who revolted from Abrocomas, the sum becomes 12,400. From this deducting 100 of *Meno's* lost, (vide sect. 25.) we have 12,300 instead of 10,400; while the amount of πελτασταί approximates to that above computed. Who is to correct these discrepancies? and how is it to be done? Not, I imagine, by the prolixities of unlearned, nor even of learned interpreters, however apparently good the hypotheses, and however really acute the reasonings with which their notes may abound.

LETTERS
TO
MR. ARCHDEACON TRAVIS,
IN ANSWER TO HIS
DEFENCE
OF THE
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES,

I JOHN v. 7.
BY R. PORSON.

LONDON:—1790.

LETTER IX.

Of the Greek writers that are quoted in favor of the verse.

Sir,

I ALMOST feel an inclination to pity you, when I enter on your Greek authorities, they are so scanty, doubtful, and suspected. According to your own computation they are only four; the Synopsis Scripturæ and the Dialogue against the Arians (both published with the works of Athanasius), the Panoplia Dogmatica of Euthymius Zigabenus, and the Greek Lectionary called Apostolos or Praxapostolos. Of these I mean to treat in their order.

First, the argument of this epistle, you say, p. 49, 102, is generally allowed to be the genuine work of Athanasius. As far as I can learn, it is generally allowed to be spurious. In some editions of the N. T. it is attributed to Euthalius. It may be found in Œcumenius without any author's name. In Mill's edition it is called Sophronius's, though Mill himself, Prol. 994, thinks it may be the work of Athanasius, "not the great prelate, (for the learned have long since decided it not to be his), but another, perhaps him who advised Euthalius to undertake his edition." Certainly it would much lessen the character of the great Athanasius, if he were the real author of such a confused and imperfect abridgement. However, genuine or spurious, "this author seems plainly to refer to the verse in question." How different are opinions! Mill, Bengelius, Wetstein, and Mr. Griesbach, affirm that it is not cited in the Synopsis. But let us attend to the proof. "The verse—is not directly quoted—but the author of it seems plainly to refer to this verse in his summary or breviatè of the fifth chapter: *The apostle, says he, here teaches the unity of the Son with the Father: for this unity is not taught in any part of that chapter,*

save in the seventh verse." This you had writtē, probably without looking at the Synopsis itself, and therefore added those useful words, "in his summary or brieve of the fifth chapter," which vanish in the second edition. A common reader might hence fancy, that the Synopsis was a correct abridgement of the whole epistle, chapter by chapter, and almost verse by verse, with the exactness and regularity of a modern commentator. But though you omit these words, you still say, at the end of the sentence, "in any part of that chapter," which supposes the very assertion you have omitted. To make the argument complete, you ought to have said, as Martin had boldly said, "in any part of the epistle," instead of mending his expression by an implied falsehood. Whoever will take the trouble of reading this same Synopsis, will find it an incoherent jumble without method or consistency. I once intended to transcribe the whole; but, to avoid the fatigue and disgust of such a task, I shall set down in their order the passages which the author cites from this epistle. i. 1. i. 5. i. 2. v. 20. iii. 8. ii. 12—14. iii. 10—18. iv. 7—12. iv. 19. 18. iii. 10. iv. 2, 3, 6. v. 16. iii. 14. iv. 8. [ii. 23.] 22. iii. 13, 14. v. 20, 21.

I may now safely appeal to every man of common sense, whether the place of any doubtful text in the Synopsis can determine its corresponding situation in the epistle. But perhaps the expressions are so peculiar as clearly to point out the seventh verse of the fifth chapter. "He also shows the unity of the Son with the Father." What! so brief that he cannot allow us the full sense of the passage, but breaks off a part and conceals the rest? Could he not have said, "He also shows the unity of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father," or "the unity of the three persons in the Godhead," or some one of a hundred other expressions, which every mind will suggest to itself? How strange is it, that he should transplant from the other parts of the epistle, so many phrases visible to the naked eye, and here make so minute a reference as requires the most powerful orthodox microscopes! Martin and you cautiously avoid quoting the entire sentence. "He also shows the unity of the Son with the Father, and that he who denies the Son, neither has the Father." The reference here is made solely to ii. 23, as Emlyn, in his Reply, p. 265, observed; to whom Martin Verité, p. 234, made so lame and shuffling a rejoinder, that, I fear, he was convinced of his error, though he had not the courage to confess it. If you object that the verse ii. 23. does not teach the unity of the Son with the Father, you must prove, 1. that the author of the Synopsis means unity of essence, not of consent; 2. that no ancient writer would or could interpret it in that manner. But, I hope, every person who has had the patience to read thus far, will be convinced that no mention is made of our verse, in this Synopsis, but that since

the author was perfectly orthodox, his silence is a probable argument that it was utterly unknown to him.

Your second authority is a dialogue between an Athanasian and an Arian, where "the verse is thus expressly quoted; 'Is not that lively and saving baptism, whereby we receive remission of sins, administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? And St. John says, And these three are one.'" You have here translated rather freely, paraphrasing some words and omitting others. You might have greatly edified your readers, if you had favored them with all the arguments by which the Athanasian convinces the Arian that the Trinity in unity is to be worshipped. I shall therefore give an abridged but faithful translation. "Why do the Seraphim, that Isaiah heard cry, Holy, Holy, Holy, neither exceed this number, nor fall short of it? Certainly because it is not lawful for any besides the Trinity to be thus honored. Why did Moses teach the people to bend their neck and their knees three times on the earth, but to denote the worship of the Trinity in one Godhead? The divine Elijah raises the dead at the third breathing, to show that no man can be worthy of eternal life, who shall not first receive with reverential faith a coequal and substantial Trinity, which like fire consumes deadly sins—Neither could Paul otherwise have ascended to the third heaven, unless he had possessed in his heart the indelible and consubstantial faith of the Trinity—Likewise is not the remission of sins procured by that quickening and sanctifying ablution, without which no man shall see the kingdom of heaven? an ablution given to the faithful in the three-blessed name. And besides all these, John says, *And the three are one.*" [or rather, "*are the one.*"]

Concerning this dialogue you tell us, "that whether it belongs to Athanasius or not, has been a matter of great dispute among the learned." Who is the author, may perhaps admit of a dispute. But all the learned at present, as far as I know, confess it to be spurious. Cave thinks it to be the composition of some docting monk. In general, however, I believe, it is attributed to Maximus, who lived in the seventh century, and resided five years in Africa and ten at Rome. You, I know, settle its date by an acute critical-remark (taken, as usual, from Martin), that because the dialogue mentions the joint reign of Constantine and Constantius, it was written before the expiration of that joint reign, A.C. 337. I always thought, Sir, that the internal notes of time, unless they be very recondite, were not decisive in feigned dialogues. The greatest dotard of a monk in the seventh, or even in the seventeenth century, might write a dialogue and mention so obvious a fact. It would be a part of his plan to throw in a circumstance of this nature, if he meant to sustain his assumed character with propriety. Works may be proved (with certain exceptions) to be spurious, if they

violate historical truth; but they cannot be proved genuine, because they do not violate it.

To the foregoing censure of Cave, which I am sorry gave that worthy man, Mr. Martin, great uneasiness, no reader of the least taste, who has perused my extract, will refuse his assent. How easily might a monk who could fix such remote, abstruse, or rather absurd senses on other passages of scripture, interpret 1 John v. 8. of the 'Trinity'? The words seem to convey at least a more mystical meaning than most of the other quotations. If he thought that such arguments as the Israelites thrice bending the neck, Elijah's thrice breathing, Paul's being rapt into the third heaven, &c. had made an impression on his antagonist, he might with equal modesty expect, that he would be completely vanquished with this testimony. It cannot be said, that this interpretation was not current among the Greeks, when Simon found it in the margin of two Mss. and Mr. Matthæi in a third. The latter scholium is this: "Three in the masculine gender, in token of the Trinity: the spirit, of the Godhead; the water, of the enlightening knowledge to mankind, by the spirit; the blood, of the incarnation." These Mss. are of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Now if this explanation could thus creep into the copies, and be recorded by the scribes as a valuable memorandum, I should be surprised to find that no author had met with it in the margin of his Mss. or in the works of the holy Doctors, or in conversation; or that, having met with it, he should impiously suffer it to rust in his possession, instead of employing it in the service of religion.

But, interrupts Martin, the words are not the exact words of the eighth verse. I answer, neither are they the exact words of the seventh. But they much more nearly resemble the eighth than the seventh. The word *eis*, as I said before, was absorbed by the three preceding letters, and lost out of the Greek Mss. from which the Latin version was made. The same omission has happened in the copies of Cyril, of Euthymius Zigabenus, I may add, of Dionysius Alexandrinus, whom Martin cites to his own confutation. But whether the copy itself that the author of the dialogue used, or the scribe who copied the dialogue, be in fault, the fault is so trifling and natural, that I wonder, 1. why it has not been more frequent; 2. why Mill should hence take occasion to object that the eighth verse is not quoted by Maximus. For, says he, all the Mss. read in the eighth verse *eis τὸ ἔν*. But this argument is not valid, unless all the Mss. of all ancient writers who quote the eighth verse, retain the preposition, which we have just seen not to be the fact. And Mr. Griesbach informs us, Symbol. Crit. p. 225, that the French King's Ms. No. 60. reads, *καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸ ἔν εἰσιν*, the precise words quoted in the dialogue.

In treating of the Latin fathers, I shall have occasion to examine more fully the subject of this allegorical interpretation. In the

mean time I pass to your next Greek witness (next in the order of time) Euthymius Zigabenus, who in his *Panoplia Dogmatica Orthodoxæ Fidei*¹ “thus refers to this verse of St. John. ‘The term *one* denotes things, the essence and nature of which are the same, and yet the persons are different, as in this instance, *And three are one.*’”

Here, Sir, I mean to surprise you with my liberal concessions. I grant that this passage relates to the Trinity. And if it be a quotation from scripture, I will grant that it is the clause of 1 John v. 7. But before we admit this second proposition, I cannot help complaining that you have been less civil than Martin, who produces the Greek original from a Ms. in the French king’s library: τὸ ἐν ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὁμοουσίων λέγεται, ἐνθα ταύτης μὲν φύσεως, ἐτερότης δὲ ὑποστάσεως, ὡς τὸ, Καὶ τὰ τρία ἓν. You might have made your English look somewhat better by rendering, *And the three are one.* But you will forgive me if I doubt a little whether Euthymius really meant this for a quotation of our verse, because he so greatly varies the expression. The verb substantive, and pronoun, are omitted, and the masculines turned into neuters. These orthodox divines were surely very inaccurate in their quotations of a most important passage. Would a mere English reader think that an author quoting these words, “And the three (things) one (thing),” could possibly mean to quote this sentence: “And these three (persons) are one (thing)?” Eucherius indeed reads the eighth, and Etherius both the seventh and eighth verses, with *tria* in the neuter; but I know no Greek writer who has done the same in either of the verses.

Though this I think might be a sufficient objection, unless Euthymius had formally declared his quotation to be a part of scripture, I shall not think much to examine more deeply into the matter. Poor Martin, turning over the Latin translation of Euthymius, saw in the margin a reference to 1 John v., and finding it contained something like the seventh verse, triumphantly added it to his cloud of witnesses. But the most ridiculous errors find somebody or other to receive and vend them for precious truths.

Ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοιον ἄγει Θεὸς, ὡς τὸν ὁμοιον.

The Latin translation is so confused, that I should have wondered if Martin, whose talent for the languages was none of the happiest, had understood it; though he might have seen cause to doubt of his own construction of the passage, if he had considered it with a little more attention or read a little farther.

A friend of mine, whose name I should be happy to mention, lent me a copy of the Greek edition of this same Euthymius Ziga-

¹ Compare Ephes. vi. 11—17.

bepus, published at Tergovisto in 1710. The place you have quoted is extant in this edition, fol. 28. col. 3 —4. Here follows a literal translation. "The word *one* is applied, 1. to things homousian, where there is a sameness of nature, but a difference of persons, as in this phrase, *And the three are one*; 2. to things heterousian, where there is a sameness of persons, but a difference of natures, as in this phrase, *And both together are one, not by nature, but by conjunction.*"¹

Every reader, even, if I stopped here, would see that if the latter quotation be not in scripture, in all probability neither is the former. But the latter certainly is not. Therefore I conclude the same of the former. Who knows how many of the authors, now lost, from whose works Euthymius extracted materials for his Panoply, expressed their faith in the same form of words? The defenders of the disputed verse catch greedily at every place where the Fathers use the expression of "Three are one," as if such expressions could not but proceed from this verse, whereas the contrary supposition is infinitely more probable, that the verse proceeded from such expressions of the Fathers.

Let us resume our translation. | "As *one* is a word variously used; for we say, *one* in number, as Peter: *one* in species, as man: *one* in genus, as animal. Thus also with respect to *two*; we say, *two* in number, as Peter and Paul: *two* in species, as man and horse: *two* in genus, as essence and color. When therefore we speak of Christ as *two*, we do not call him *two* in number, but *one* in number by the unity of person, and *two* in species, that is, in nature, by the duality of natures; for Gregory the divine says, *and both together are one, not by nature, but by conjunction.*" When I came to this sentence, I quickly conjectured (and who would not conjecture?) that since the second of these quotations bore the superscription of Gregory Nazianzen, the first too might issue from the same mint. And, to my unspeakable comfort, I found my conjecture right. The second of the passages is in vol. i. Orat. xxxvi. p. 582. D.; the first, Orat. xxxix. p. 630. B. Having been always extremely fond of Gregory, I cannot forbear transcribing as much of the context as may enlighten the reader. "But when I speak, may lightning, as it were, flash around you, from the three lights and one of God: *three*, according to their proprieties or hypostases, if any prefer that word, or persons (for we will have no quarrel about names, so long as the syllables direct

¹ From this place to l. 5, p. 203, except the parenthesis, the Emperor Justin II. has stolen word for word in his epistle to all the Christians in the world; and towards the end of the epistle employs almost the very words of the parenthesis. Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. v. 4. p. 422. [From the *List of Additions and Corrections.*]

as to the same sense), and *one*, according to the consideration of their essence or Godhead: for it is divided indivisibly, if I may use the expression, and connected divisibly.¹ For the Godhead is one in three, and the three are one; those [three] in which the Godhead is, or, to speak more accurately, which the Godhead is: but we will avoid excesses and defects; neither turning the unity into confusion, nor the distinction into separation. Far be from us both the conjunction of Sabellius, and the division of Arius; evils diametrically opposite, and equally partaking of impiety." And in the next page, "There is then one God in three [persons], and the three are one, as we said."

I believe that Mr. Travis himself will excuse me from any farther examination of this authority. But since I have promised to produce every argument that to my knowledge has been or may be urged against me, I must not conceal that in the same edition of Euthymius, fol. 112. col. 1, a part of the epistle of John is thus quoted, "*And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear record on earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater.*—See now again, how the preacher of truth calls the Spirit by nature God and of God; for having said that it is the Spirit of God that witnesses, a little onward he adds, the witness of God is greater. How then is he a creature, &c."

Upon this passage I observe, first, that an author who adopts this reasoning must have been ignorant of the seventh verse. How could he otherwise have missed the opportunity of insisting on the commutation of the three persons, the assertion of their joint testimony and of their unity? Euthymius's reasoning at present receives all its vigor from the close conjunction of the sixth, eighth, and ninth verses, and is only clogged by the insertion of the seventh.

Secondly, I observe, that all these testimonies and arguments Euthymius professes, f. 109. c. 4, to copy from Cyril's Thesaurus. I have seen this quotation with my own eyes in Cyril's Thesaurus; but, instead of the seventh and eighth verses, not a word more than, *For there are three that bear record, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and the three are one.*

Thirdly, I observe, that the Latin translation (Tit. xii. near the end) thus reads the place: *Et Spiritus est qui Deum Spiritum veritatem esse testatur. Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium afferunt, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt. Si testi-*

¹ Ἐν γὰρ ἐν πρῶτῳ ἡ θεότης καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν ᾧ: ἡ θεότης, ἡ ποιεῖ ἀκρίβειαν, ἡ ἡ θεότης. See too Orat. xxxviii. p. 596. A. li. p. 739. B.

monium, &c. The translator, therefore, had not the verse in his Greek copy. But wherever I set my steps, I stumble on fresh examples of forgery. This translator, though more modest than his brother the Greek editor, could not resist the pleasure of inserting the word *Deum* contrary to the text of scripture, and the scope of his author's argument. When shall we cease to give our adversaries occasion of reproaching us with pious fraud on the one hand, or childish credulity on the other?

Fourthly, I observe, that three Mss. of Euthymius, collated by Mr. Matthæi,¹ exactly agree with Cyril, except that one has a very slight variation. To these I add another in the Bodleian, which I myself inspected, and a fifth in the library of Trinity college, Cambridge, of which an extract is now lying before me. So far therefore is Euthymius Zigabenus from having employed this weapon against the heretics, that on the contrary it is plain he never had it to employ. It was not to be found in the shops of those artificers of faith, who furnished him with the materials for his Panoply.

From Euthymius to your Apostolos, that is, from one interpolation to another, is a gentle transition. Newton had said, "The Greeks received it (1 John v. 7.) not till this present age, when the Venetians sent it amongst them in printed books" (meaning this Apostolos). On this you ask two sapient questions, "Was the Apostolos not known to the Greeks till this present age? Was the Apostolos a printed book?" 1. You might have recollected that Newton's Dissertation was written in the last century, in the beginning of which the Apostolos was printed at Venice. 2. Yes, Sir, the Apostolos is a printed book, so far as it is an authority for the disputed verse. Newton knew that the printed book contained the verse, but he had reason to declare it an interpolation. For he tells us, from the information of some of his acquaintance, that the Ms. Lectionaries of the Greeks omitted the verse; and that the Greeks, when they were attacked on this subject, appealed to their printed copies, and affirmed that it was erased by the Arians.

Your ingenious idea that the ancient Greek church from the fifth century acknowledged this verse, because it is now in their Apostolos, rests on this foundation, that the readings of the Apostolos have never been altered. But La Croze says, and with truth I believe, that ecclesiastical books are more subject to alterations than others.* Your reasoning on this assertion is so curious, that I confess myself unable to understand it. You ask, whether the church would at any time insert a reading which she did not believe to be genuine. Suppose that she would not; yet in case of various readings, the church would, sometimes from haste, sometimes from

¹ On the Catholic Epistles, p. 142—143.

ignorance, sometimes from indolence, sometimes from a blind obedience to the dictates of a leader who pretended to superior learning or holiness, give a spurious reading the sanction of her authority.

I cannot allow the Greek church to have been so nice and critical as you would make her, because I should then cede to her the palm of learning and fidelity, to which, I firmly believe, our church has an equal right. But if we may judge from ourselves, the overseers of the Greek church gave themselves little trouble about genuine readings in the public service, provided nothing heterodox was admitted. In one of the early editions of our Bible, with the Common Prayer prefixed, the text of the N. T. marks 1 John v. 7. as doubtful; in the epistle for the first Sunday after Easter it is printed in the same character, and no suspicion insinuated. To which I may add, that we have now for more than two hundred years been proving the doctrine of our XXIXth article by an interpolated quotation from Augustine. The words *licet carnaliter et visibiliter corporis et sanguinis Christi Sacramentum dentibus premant* are rejected by all the Mss. (about twenty) that have been collated by the Louvain and the Paris editors. Augustine, Tract. in Joann. xxvi. near the end.

In the year 1200 the Archbishop of Lyons sent an humble petition to the chapter-general of Cîteaux, praying that the gospel concerning the passion of our Lord—might be corrected. An abbot was accordingly ordered to make inquiry, and communicate the result to the next chapter. The chapter's order is thus expressed: "*Scribatur in textu Matthæi Evangelistæ, ubi deest, Diviserunt sibi vestimenta.*"¹

The biographer of Lanfranc,* Archbishop of Canterbury, tells us, that his Grace corrected the Old and N. T. and the writings of the holy Fathers, according to the orthodox faith. Can we wonder that men thus affected, when they found a text which apparently suited their purpose, struggling into notice, but not yet generally received, should be biassed, by their preconceived opinions, and endeavor to give it currency among their spiritual subjects by the stamp of their own approbation?

If our Apostolos, which the perpetual demand of the church would multiply in numberless copies, constantly retained this verse from the fifth century, by what fate or chance has every transcriber forgot to restore it to the other Mss. which were not intended for public service? The critics complain that the Evangelistaries and Lectionaries have often transfused their readings into the other Mss. But in this case the two streams of the public and private Mss. have flowed as distinct and unmingled as Alpheus and the ocean. Of the Ms. Lectionaries that have been

¹ Wetstein Proleg. p. 85.

collated, none contain the three heavenly-witnesses. If, therefore, it were certain that the copy from which the Apostolos was printed, did contain them, the question would be, which authority we ought to follow?

Newton's appeal to the Greek Mss. you with your accustomed civility call, not an argument, but an assertion too extravagant for a serious refutation. For you say, p. 259. "How a Greek Ms. omitting 1 John v. 7. copied out at Paris or Rome in the tenth century, can be a proof that the verse was wanting in the Mss. that Jerome used at Palestine in the fourth century, is utterly inconceivable." If you cannot conceive this, your conceptions are very narrow. This observation, however, of yours, applied to the Apostolos, will be as proper as it is now absurd. "How a Lectionary printed at Venice in the seventeenth century, fourscore years after 1 John v. 7. had been inserted in the Greek editions of the N. T. can be a proof that the same verse was extant in all the Ms. Lectionaries from the fifth century downward, is utterly inconceivable!"

The Apostolos, Sir, was interpolated in printing. You will perhaps bring your old argument, which is nearly worn out, on the stage, that if the editor inserted this verse without the authority of Mss. he was a cheat. But he was not a cheat, and therefore, &c. This kind concern for the morality of editors I greatly admire. But I do not accuse the editor of being a cheat. Who ever called R. Stephens a cheat, because he retains many readings in his edition, which he found in no Ms.? Every editor, unless he makes actual profession to the contrary, is at liberty to follow the text of his predecessors. Common readers are ignorant what licence editors take in reforming the text of Mss. to their own notions of correctness. The Venetian overseer of the press, having been long familiar with the vulgar reading, would naturally suppose the omission to be a mere error of the copier. He would doubtless have a printed N. T. at hand, for the greater ease and quicker dispatch. When he came to this place, if he had any regard for the credit of the printed editions, or for the finest passage in scripture, he would add it to the Apostolos, and instead of thinking himself guilty of rashness or pious fraud, would plume himself on his zeal and vigilance in the cause of orthodoxy. The instances of interpolation which I have produced in the Syriac version, the Slavonic, and the editions of Euthymius, will infuse into any reasonable man a distrust of publishers who conceal the authority on which they act in cautious silence. All editions, as well of scripture as other books where scripture is quoted, that give a text without notes or various readings, are by themselves incompetent witnesses. • The less scandal they give to the simplicity of the vulgar, the more they excite the suspicions of the learned.

The confession of faith, though I cannot tell when it was first made, is, I am sure, too late to have any weight. The modern Greek version only serves to show with what eagerness this verse was every where received as soon as it was known.

When I think on the miserable poverty of Greek authorities under which you labor, I am astonished that you would not accept the additional testimonies offered by Bengelius, Wetstein, and Mr. Griesbach. Bengelius wishes to draw over to his party Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athenagoras, and Basil; but they are so shy, that he is obliged to use violence; and even then they perform their work in a very awkward manner. The place from Basil looks most like our verse, “Deus, et Verbum, et Spiritus, una Deitas et sola adoranda.” If this be a quotation of 1 John v. 7, no verse has greater plenty of evidence to boast, for it is quoted by every ancient writer who has expressed his belief in three persons and one God. A scholion ascribed to Origen on Psalm cxliii. 2. Δούλοι κυρίων Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ πνεῦμα καὶ σῶμα παιδίσκη δὲ κυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ δὲ τρία Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν, οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν. *The spirit and the body are servants to their masters, the Father and Son; the soul is maiden to her mistress, the Holy Ghost; the three is (or are) our Lord God; for the three are one.* The critical chemistry that could extract the doctrine of the Trinity from this place, must have been exquisitely refining. Andreas Cretensis, καὶ τὰ τρία εἰς Θεὸς, τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ Θεότης. Taken from Gregory Nazianzen above quoted. The *Novum Canon* published by Cotelerius, ἀνὰ τὰ τρία, Πατὴρ—ἔν ταῦτα τὰ τρία.

I hardly know whether I ought to mention the *Philopatris*, a dialogue written early in the fourth century, and falsely ascribed to Lucian, where the Christian Trinity is thus ridiculed: “The high-ruling God—the Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one of three and three of one, think these to be Jupiter, believe this to be God.” To which the other answers, “You teach me to swear in arithmetic; one three and three one; I know not what you mean.” Cave is so overjoyed at this testimony, that he undertakes to prove from it the genuineness of the three heavenly witnesses; and having finished his task to his own satisfaction, concludes most mathematically, “Quod erat demonstrandum.” Either my eye-sight is dimmer than Cave’s, or my reason less tractable, or my faith weaker: for many years since, while I had no heretical scruples about the verse in question, I read this dialogue without discovering any allusion. Bishop Eugenius too, who published Joseph Bryennius, and translated Virgil’s *Georgics* into Greek hexameters, seems to be of my

opinion; for after mentioning Cave's demonstration, he adds, 'Sed gentilem illum auctorem relinquamus, qui forsitan non ex Joannis epistola, sed ex propalato jam tunc Christianorum dogmate—unitatem naturæ—cum Trinitate—subsannare scurriliter intendebat.' But if you, Sir, think you can make any use of this authority, I beg you not to stand on ceremony. Κοινὰ γὰρ τὰ τῶν φίλων.

I allow, however, that two Greek writers do quote this verse in full and express terms, Emanuel Calecas² and Joseph Bryennius.³ Both eminent for antiquity and fidelity. Calecas wrote about the middle of the fourteenth century, and Bryennius at the beginning of the fifteenth. I shall have occasion hereafter to mention Calecas. At present I shall only observe, that the Acts of the Lateran council having been then long translated into Greek, it is more wonderful that so few, than that so many Greeks have quoted the disputed verse. As to Bryennius, he manifestly borrows from the Latin version. He reads ὁ Χριστὸς in the sixth verse, instead of τὸ Πνεῦμα, and omits the clause of the eighth verse. And since he quotes Thomas Aquinas in another place,⁴ I doubt not but that he was also indebted to him for this piece of information.

Let us now review the troops which you are leading to this dangerous battle. 1. A Synopsis of the first epistle of John, attributed to Athanasius, or Euthalius, or Sophronius, which quotes ii. 23. to prove the unity of the Father with the Son. 2. A dialogue, at least as old as the seventh century, written by Maximus or somebody else, which quotes the last words of the eighth verse, and applies them to the Trinity. 3. Euthymius Zigabenus, who quotes these words, "and the three are one," from Gregory Nazianzen's Oration on the holy Lights, and has been since compelled by his editor to quote 1 John v. 7. 4, 5. Calecas, who probably borrowed the verse from the Lateran council; and Bryennius, who certainly borrowed it from the Vulgate. 6. Lastly, a Lec-tionary printed at Venice in the year 1602, which Bengelius pronounces "to be in this place certainly interpolated from the Latin; for the lesson in the Arabic version, for the same day of the same week, knows nothing of the verse."

Whether so small, faint-hearted, and mutinous a band, can make head against the enemy's host, I will endeavor to calculate, when I have concluded my account of the Latin writers.

¹ Fragm. Epist. ad Matthæi Pref. ad Epist. Cath. p. lviii.

² P. 217. Ed. Coteler. Combefis, Gr. Patr. Auctar. Noviss. Part. II. p. 215.

³ Tom. i. p. 241. ed. Lips. 1768.

⁴ Tom. i. p. 322.

LETTER X.

Of the Latin writers before Jerome that are quoted in favor of the verse.

Sir,

If you sing *Te Deum* when you are most shamefully routed, what triumphs may we not expect from you when you lead your Latins into the field, whose first appearance at least promises some show of resistance? These Latins I shall divide into two classes, the writers before and the writers after Jerome's time: for all the evidence of your Old Italic must be given by the former set. You are sensible of the scantiness of your present allowance, and therefore wish to make all the Latins down to the end of the seventh century vouchers for this version. But this, Sir, is either ignorance or sophistry. If Jerome restored the disputed verse about the end of the fourth century, his name was neither so little known, nor his authority so little respected, that none of the succeeding writers for three hundred years would adopt a most important passage from his edition. You have only to prove (which you can do with as much ease as you prove most of your positions) that Jerome's successors, though they constantly read and greatly esteemed his works, resolutely rejected all his emendations, slighted his new edition, and stuck to their ancient Vulgate. In the mean time, your Ante-Hieronymian witnesses are Tertullian, Cyprian, and Phœbadius.

Tertullian's words are these: "*He shall take* (says the Son) *of mine* (John xvi. 14.) as I myself of the Father's. Thus the connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes three [persons] cohering one with the other, which three are one [being, *unum*], not one [person, *unus*], as it is written, *I and my Father are one.*" (John x. 30.)

As often as I read this sentence, so often I am astonished that the words *tres unum sunt* should ever be urged as a quotation. On the contrary, it appears to me demonstrable, that, instead of being a quotation, they are the words of Tertullian himself, and expressly distinguished from the words of scripture.

1. Tertullian does not declare them to be a quotation. This objection, you say, is ill founded; and you prove, in five pages, that authors often quote without giving notice. You are sometimes, Sir, very amusing, when you prove what no man ever denied. A few pages farther, we shall find you proving that a quotation from scripture is often introduced with, *it is written*. But this, Sir, is not the whole of the objection; that Tertullian does not mark these words as a quotation, but that having been so accurate as to declare two passages to be quotations, one immediately preceding, and one immediately succeeding, he should pass over the words in question without any remark, such as, *in-*

quit, or dictum est, or scriptum est. If the three heavenly witnesses were in his copy of the N. T., why does he never appeal to them in the rest of this treatise, particularly in his twenty-second chapter, where he insists, at length, on the expression, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*; which he quotes five times in the whole book? His argument, on this subject, takes up half a page of your appendix: yet he is content with a slight and transient allusion to a text, which is twice as important as the other, and, by its peculiarity of expression, demanded a double share of his attention. Ought he not to have expected that the heretics would have endeavored to elude the force of this argument, and pervert it to their own doctrine, as they had perverted John x. 30.? Would he not have been equally diffuse on the plural verb joined to the neuter singular? Let any man peruse the first page of your Appendix, and he must see that if Tertullian had then two texts before him, one asserting the unity of two of the divine persons, the other the unity of all the three, he must have been strangely forgetful, or something worse, to reason so much on his weaker authority, and so little on his stronger. If in the sequel a passage occurs, that might admit a doubt, whether it be a quotation or not, it is surely a circumstance of weight enough to turn the scale, that nothing was said of it three chapters before, where it might very usefully have been confronted with an unsuspected quotation.

2. In reading the Fathers, great caution is necessary. They often paraphrase what is concise; explain what is obscure; supply what is defective; "and truths divine come mended from their pen." Often they add their own corollaries to the words of scripture, or so mix their quotation with the web of their argument, that without a Bible at hand, it is difficult to determine, where the scripture or the author speaks. An instance of this may be seen in this very sentence of Tertullian: "He shall take of mine, as I myself of, the Father's." If any important consequence could be drawn from these last words, no doubt but they would be defended with as much zeal, as the *tres unum sunt* which follow. Nor should I have wondered, if Cyprian, or Phœbadus had taken them for the genuine words of the Evangelist, and quoted them without scruple, on the authority of Tertullian. And if I were disposed to assert, that Tertullian's copy of the gospel in John xvi. 14. added, "*sicut ipse de Patris*," I should have a better color for my opinion, than you have for yours. But you say, that "Tertullian, after proving the unity of the Son with the Father, by a quotation from St. John, proceeds to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost, by another quotation from the same St. John, 'which shows a like unity of three persons in the godhead.'" I absolutely deny the truth of the latter assertion; to the rest I have no objection. I allow that Tertullian, having proved the

unity of the Father and Son from St. John, proceeds to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost from the same St. John. But he proves it from the gospel, not from the epistle. To avoid prolixity, I will state Tertullian's reasoning as clearly as I can; and I engage to defend my exposition, as giving the only consistent sense of which the words are capable.

"The unity of the Father and Son is frequently declared in scripture, but most plainly in John x. 30. Praxeas makes this an unity of number; whereas, it ought to be interpreted of an unity of substance. For, if unity of person were intended, Christ would have said, *unus*, not *unum*. And the same sort of unity, that the Son has with the Father, the Holy Spirit has with the Son. For as the Son is sent by the Father, and speaks the words that he receives from the Father, so is the Spirit sent by the Son, and speaks the words that he receives from the Son; as the Son himself affirms: 'He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.' Whatever unity, therefore, there is of the Father and Son, the same is the unity of the Son and Spirit; consequently, the same is the unity of all the three; which three are, therefore, one. When I say one, I mean not one person, but one substance. And for this reason, to avoid the subtilties of Praxeas, I use the Latin word *unum*, not *unus*; in which I conform myself to the scriptural phrase, and apply the same expression to the three persons, that the Scripture itself has applied to two."

If Tertullian had proposed to himself, to declare his belief of the Trinity, in imitation of John x. 30, he could not have invented a form of words different from the form that he has chosen. He could not say *tres unus sunt*, much less, *tres unus est*; because, he then would, by his own confession, seem to favor the heresy of Praxeas. But, as his words now stand, the imitation is perfect; and the very order of the subject, predicate, and verb, exactly observed. I shall therefore affirm, that Tertullian not only does not quote these magic words, *tres unum sunt*, from St. John, but that he plainly confesses them to be his own, and defends them by the analogy of scripture.

Most of the editions of Tertullian read, *tres unum sint*, which would rather strengthen my cause. But I shall make no use of this reading, because it might easily be a mistake of the copiers; or, perhaps, of the press. Tertullian has also been thought to refer to 1 John v. 7. in two other places, de Pudicitia § 21. c. Praxeam § 30. Concerning these two places I shall say nothing; whether because I think them of too much consequence, or of too little, I leave, Sir, to your sagacious conjecture.

Eucherius, after proving the Trinity from Psalm xxxiii. 6. and other texts, concludes thus, "Ergo Pater ex quo omnia, Filius per quem omnia, Spiritus Sanctus in quo omnia, sicut et Apostolus dicit, (Rom. xi. 36.) 'Quoniam ex ipso et per ipsum, et in ipso

sunt omnia, ipsi gloria in sæcula sæculorum.'” The construction of this sentence is the same as of the passage in Tertullian. But it is clear, that the words immediately preceding *sicut* are Eucherius's own, which he justifies by the subsequent authority. In like manner, the words immediately preceding *quomodo* are Tertullian's own, which he justifies by the subsequent authority. I request the reader to bear this place in mind, when I examine Cyprian's testimony.

Phœbadius (excuse me for violating chronology) plainly imitates Tertullian, as Bengelius observes, and therefore is not a distinct evidence. If you object, with Bengelius, that the particle *quia* implies a quotation, I answer, 1. That this is too slender a presumption to support an argument. Or if it must be a quotation, it is a quotation from Tertullian. 2. If I allowed it to be meant for a quotation of scripture, you could then only prove, that Phœbadius had read Cyprian, or some author who had read Cyprian. 3. The editions vary, some retaining, others omitting *quia*.

On Cyprian, therefore, the whole labor of supporting this verse is devolved. He seems to quote it in two places. One of these receives all its force from the other; and if Cyprian shall not appear to have quoted 1 John v. 7. in his treatise de Unitate, neither will he appear to have quoted it in his epistle to Jubaianus. I allow, that by saying, “Of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, *And these (or the) three are one*,” Cyprian affirms, the words which follow, *it is written*, to be extant in scripture. Why would he not quote the entire seventh verse, as we have it at present? Alas! what unkind and perverse mortals were these holy fathers! Half a minute more time, half an inch more parchment, would have cleared up all doubts, established the wavering, confounded the gain-sayers, and saved a multitude of souls. But, whether through envy, or haste, they huddled the most important texts into the shortest compass, though they are tedious and diffuse on others, where we could have wished them to be more concise.

It has been made a question, ever since the time of Simon, whether Cyprian quotes our present seventh verse, or only applies the eighth by a mystical interpretation to the Trinity? The second supposition is so strongly supported, by the authority of Facundus, that you will find some difficulty in setting aside his testimony. Facundus himself, interpreting the spirit, water and blood of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, at last seems apprehensive that his adversaries may possibly object to his explanation; he, therefore, reserves as his strongest argument, the authority of Cyprian: “Aut si forsitan ipsi Trinitatem, quæ unus Deus est, nolunt intelligi, secundum ipsa verba, quæ posuit pro Apostolo Joanne, respondeant—Quod tamen Joannis Apostoli testimonium B. Cyprianus Carthaginensis antistes et martyr, in epistola sive

libro quem de Unitate scripsit, de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit. Ait enim: ‘Dicit Dominus, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*; et iterum de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, *et hi tres unum sunt*.” Such a thundering proof as this, left no room for objection; in the progress, therefore, of his dispute, he refers to this place again, and takes it for granted, that he has undeniably proved his point. “Nam sic ecclesia Christi, etiam cum necdum ad distinctionem Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti uteretur nomine personæ, tres credidit et prædicavit, P. et F. et Sp. S. sicut testimonio Joannis supra docuimus, quo dictum est: *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt*.” I shall now desire the reader to consider your modest assertion, p. 40. 82. that “what Facundus or Cyprian understood, concerning the eighth verse, is immaterial to the dispute about the seventh.” On the contrary, I affirm, that Facundus, urging the heretics with the distinction of persons in the Trinity, which is taught in the eighth verse, and confirming his explanation by this very passage of Cyprian, shows, first, that he himself knew nothing of the seventh verse; and, secondly, that Cyprian, in his opinion, knew no more, but extracted the doctrine of the Trinity from the eighth. Could Facundus, with a text before his eyes that would have gained him an easy victory over his enemies, labor through several pages to bend this untractable verse to his purpose? “The Spirit,” says he, “signifies the Father, for *God is a Spirit*, (John iv. 24.) the water, the Holy Ghost (see John vii. 37, 38.) the blood, the Son, he alone of the Holy Trinity partaking of flesh and blood.” If the seventh verse was then in the generality of the Latin copies, Facundus had not only lost his wits, to use a weak reason, when he had a stronger to produce, but his honesty too, in forcing an absurd interpretation of scripture on Cyprian, which he well knew to be his own, and not Cyprian’s.

Why then might not Cyprian give the sense of 1 John v. 8. in his own words, and say, “Of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, *these three are one*?” To this question you answer, in Houyhnhnm language, that “Cyprian would then have said the thing which was not; that he would have been guilty of an intentional falsehood; a supposition altogether monstrous and abominable.” You might have a little lowered these tragical outcries, if you had considered, that the goodness, or badness, of every action may be considered in two lights; with respect to the quality of the action itself, and to the intention of the agent. That Cyprian set down his own sense of the eighth verse with an intention to mislead his readers, is an odious, and, unless it be well supported, an abominable accusation. But who accuses Cyprian of a deliberate falsehood? This is your constant refuge, when argument fails you, to represent with all your pathos, the injury

done to illustrious characters, such as Cyprian, Stunica, Stephens, Beza, &c.

If Cyprian gave his own sense of a particular verse, and said, "So it is written," though he might occasion error in others, I should not, without very strong reasons, suspect him of absolute fraud. I wish, indeed, that it were the custom to quote with more accuracy; but we know too well, that all authors (and frequently in controversy) quote, not the very words, but the sense and scope of them, or what they take to be the sense, and sometimes without warning the reader. If I had said in my III Letter, p. 42, that you profess, p. 11. 16, a willingness to believe that Mr. Gibbon, on a certain occasion, would have acted like a knave, should I have been guilty of fraud, because I had quoted your words according to what I thought to be their true meaning? I would not be understood to defend this practice universally; I think it blameable in general, and often productive of great mistakes. All that I aver is, that it merits no harsher name, where no evil intention appears, than inaccuracy. Whatever I conceive to be the real import of a passage, I have a right to set down in what words I choose, so long as I believe it to be the true sense, and mean to mislead nobody. Facundus has the following sentence: "Joannes Apostolus in epistola sua de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto sic¹ dicit: *tres sunt qui testimonium dant**—*et hi tres unum sunt.*" If Facundus had only quoted these words, and not been imprudent enough to quote and explain at length, he would have been with you a positive evidence for the authenticity of the seventh verse; but at present, unhappily, the break is filled up with * *in terra Spiritus aqua et sanguis*. I would observe, that Facundus uses the word *dicit*, and is just as peremptory in the application of the eighth verse to the Trinity, as Cyprian is in the application of his supposed seventh. A little after Facundus says, "Non ergo ait Joannes Apostolus loquens de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto, *tres sunt personæ quæ testificantur*, &c." Facundus, we see, affirming that the apostle speaks of the Trinity, affirms it in terms equally forcible with Cyprian's "*scriptum est*," and yet we are certain that Facundus applies only the eighth verse; we have, therefore, a right to conclude, that Cyprian does the same. If Facundus had been as reserved as Cyprian, and only quoted a part of the eighth verse, as I have done for him; if then the testimony of a later writer should be produced to this effect,

¹ Arator says, A. A. ii. 909: "Hic Judæa vacans, sterilis quæ dicitur arbor, Expectata tribus fructum non attulit annis," &c. Here is Judæa said to be called the barren tree in Scripture, as positively as *et tres unum sunt* is said, by Cyprian, to be written of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But no man in his senses, I hope, will contend that Arator's copy of Luke xiii. added a formal application of the parable to Judæa.

“quod testimonium B. Facundus de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit,” you would reject it with as much contempt, and as little reason, as now you reject the same testimony given by Facundus concerning Cyprian.

Was the allegorical method of interpretation uncommon among the Fathers? No; we know that they employed it without scruple in all points, whether of doctrine or morals. Bengelius, it is true, seems to think that the primitive fathers, or at least Cyprian, were not tainted with the contagion of allegory. “That the reader¹ may judge of this the better, I will transcribe the words that follow the former quotation. ‘The Scripture says, *Of his coat, because from the upper part it was not sewed, but woven throughout, they said, let us not divide it, but cast lots for it.* The coat carried unity, coming from the upper part, that is, from heaven and from the Father, which could in no wise be rent by him that received it,’ &c. Again, in his treatise on the Lord’s Prayer: ‘We find that Daniel and the three children chose for their hours of prayer, the third, sixth and ninth, a sign of the mystery of the Trinity, which was to be revealed in after times.’ What wonder, that a writer of this stamp should forcibly apply these words, *tres unum sunt*, to the Trinity, though he were wholly ignorant of the seventh verse?”

In truth, the allegorical interpretations of the scripture given by the ancient writers, are so numerous, that it would be endless to pursue them. I shall content myself with three of the most ingenious, and most pertinent to the subject. Ecclesiast. iv. 12. “A threefold cord is not quickly broken.” This is explained by Origen, Basil, Jerome, and Ambrose,² of the Trinity. If any of these able divines had thus expressed himself: “Of the unity of the Trinity it is written, ‘A threefold cord,’ &c.” who would pronounce him guilty of an intentional falsehood? None, I am persuaded, except Martin and yourself, whose feelings on these subjects are painfully acute.

“When² Christ says to his disciples, that three loaves ought

¹ Griesbach, tom. ii. p. 230.

² Arator Act. Apost. ii. 896.

Discipulis quod Christus ait, jam nocte roganti
Tres panes debere dari: nox ista profecto est
Mundus, ut hic siquis verbi desideret escas,
Exhibeas, quæsite, dapes, doceasque volentem,
Quod Pater et Natus, quod Sanctus Spiritus unus
Sint Deus, et numerum triplicet substantia simplex.
Nec semel hæc pia jussa canunt. Angariat, inquit,
Te quicumque petens, ut pergas præviis unum,
Cetera vade simul duo millia: nonne videntur
Hoc mandata loqui? si quis, te consulit errans
Ignarusque via, quid sit Deus, edere malis,

to be given to him that asks by night (Luke xi, 5.) that night is the world, in which if any desires the meat of the word, you ought to produce your stores, and teach him, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are one God, a single substance in a triple number. The sacred precepts repeat this more than once. Whoever presses you one mile, go with him also the other two; (Matth. v. 41.) does he not seem to say; if any man in error asks you, what God is, tell him that he is first the Father, next subjoin that he is the Son and the gracious Spirit, three in number and yet one."

If one of the Fathers had written this sentence, "Our Saviour said to the Jewish nation, 'Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever,'" an accuser would be ridiculous, who should charge him with having quoted falsely; for that these words are said to the fig-tree, Matth. xxi. 18. and not to the Jews. But how much more ridiculous would a defender be, who should maintain that the Father had certainly an additional paragraph in his copy, where our Saviour thus spoke to the Jews, or at least an additional verse explaining the allegory; and that to suspect the holy man of giving his own interpretation for the words of scripture, would be monstrous and abominable!

Lord Shaftesbury thus blasphemously derides the language of the holy scriptures: "I have seen in certain Christian churches an ancient piece or two affirmed on the solemn faith of priestly tradition to have been angelically and divinely wrought; but having observed the whole style and manner to vary from the rules of art, I presumed to assert, that if the pencil had been heaven-guided, it could never have been so lame in its performance." Would a defender of Shaftesbury gravely argue that I have here been guilty of an intentional falsehood; that Shaftesbury says not a word of the scriptures, but merely of some pictures that were shown to him in certain churches for celestial workmanship? In such a case I should answer, if I could keep my countenance, that I had supposed Lord Shaftesbury by this allegory to ridicule the scriptures themselves; that the veil which covered his real meaning, was so transparent, that every body might see it, without my tearing it off; that however I was guilty of no intentional falsehood, for I firmly believed what I said, and that the morality of such matters is not to be measured by the soundness of our judgment, but by the strength of our persuasion. I make no doubt but Facundus was as fully convinced that he and Cyprian had rightly interpreted 1 John v. 8. as I am that I have rightly interpreted Lord Shaftesbury. The only objection re-

Prode Patrem, subjunge libens, quod Filius, et quod Spiritus est alius, numero tres et tamen unus.

¹ Characteristics, vol. iii. p. 230.

maining, which can seem to have any weight, that Cyprian was not capable of so absurd an interpretation, I have in part answered already; and I shall observe farther, that no man ought to dispute on any subject where the Fathers are concerned, who either knows not, or will not own, that many interpretations of scripture to the full as absurd as this may be found in their works. To mention one. Many of the Fathers prove the divinity and eternal generation of the Logos from Psalm xlv. 1. "*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum.*" But the mere English Christian is defrauded of this argument for his faith by our heretical translation, "my heart is inditing of a good matter."¹

Cyprian is elsewhere negligent in quoting, as in Matth. vi. 13. "Suffer us not to be led into temptation." Apoc. xix. 10. "Worship thou the Lord Jesus." 1 John ii. 17. he ~~five~~ times adds, "as God remains for ever." The first and second you defend. I shall therefore examine the first, to give a specimen of your talents, for you never are more pleasant than when you talk about criticism. You think, "Lead us not into temptation," which is found in some Mss., the genuine reading. The note in the inner margin of the Oxford Cyprian is thus expressed: "'Ne nos inducas,' Ar. Ebor. Pemb. Lin. Voss. 2. Bod. 3, 4. Vict." which you p. 41. 89. thus improve, as usual. "'Lead us not into temptation' are the words of the Arundelian Ms., of those from Pembroke College, Cambridge, of those from York, from Lincoln College, Oxford, of one belonging to Vossius, two Bodleian Mss. and one belonging to the monastery of St. Victor." Let any reader, who has not Cyprian before him, count your list; he must be wrong; he will at least make nine, and may, if he chooses, make twenty Mss. in favor of your reading, though in the edition itself it is manifest to the eye, that they are only eight. The Mss. collated to this treatise of Cyprian are in all twenty-one. If I reasoned like you, I should claim the other thirteen, as all agreeing in the common reading. However, since the collation is in general very exact, I think I shall be very generous, if I strike off four as neutrals, and only suppose nine to be in my favor. To these nine I add two in the Museum, both which read, "Suffer us not to be led," in each of the places where Cyprian quotes the clause. We have, therefore, a clear majority on the side of the editions.

Secondly. This majority will be greatly increased, when we learn, that the same clause is repeated again in this treatise of Cyprian, and that only three Mss. desert the vulgar reading.

Thirdly. The third evidence is in favor of this reading. For there was a plain reason why the copiers should alter

¹ Whoever desires more of these interpretations, may surfeit himself by consulting Whitby's *Dissertatio de S. Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios*.

Cyprian's quotation to that reading of the gospel which was familiar to themselves. And wherever, in a quotation of scripture, two readings are equal in other respects, that which differs from the received text is commonly genuine.

Fourthly, Augustine expressly quotes this variation from Cyprian, as you might have learned from your friend Beza. I conclude therefore that the present text of Cyprian is right, and that Matthew Prior was not wrong, when he said or sung, that "Authors before they write, should read," a caution to which some of your friends, Sir, have not paid sufficient regard.

If you are curious to know how Cyprian came to adopt this gloss instead of the genuine reading, I am almost certain, that he was deceived by an imperfect recollection of Tertullian. We learn from Jerome, that Cyprian was a constant reader of Tertullian, whom he called his master. And from Cyprian's imitations, we might learn the same thing without Jerome's information. Tertullian then having explained *De Orat.* § 8. the clause "Lead us not" by "Suffer us not to be led," his scholar, as many scholars are apt to do, took his master's interpretation for gospel. Thus he quotes in the Council of Carthage, § 6. John iii. 6. with the spurious addition, borrowed from Tertullian *de Carne Christi*, § 18. of which I shall take another occasion to speak.

"But though Facundus indeed tells us that Cyprian meant only to interpret the eighth verse by that sentence, *Of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost it is written, And these three are one*, Fulgentius directly and positively represents Cyprian as quoting the seventh." Fulgentius's word is *confitetur*, which, you say, frequently means in the best writers to declare, to show, to profess. And for this you refer to your trusty friend, "the dictionary of Ainsworth," of whose two examples one has been corrected from Mss. (*Sueton. Aug.* 4.) the other I have not been able to find, but I will venture to prophesy that it is a mistake; a third, which "the *Thesaurus of Gesner*" would have supplied, is either corrupt or nothing to the purpose. Yet I shall lay no stress on this argument, because, in that barbarous age, strange liberties were sometimes taken in the use of words. I shall also grant, that Fulgentius quotes our seventh verse, and does not adopt the mystical exposition of the eighth from Cyprian, as Emlyn pretends. I shall attack Fulgentius's testimony on a new ground. I affirm, that it is no testimony at all, except to the genuineness of the passage in Cyprian. Fulgentius fairly confesses (or if you will, shows, declares, professes,) that he became acquainted with this verse solely by the means of Cyprian, and that he had not seen it himself in the copies of the N. T. Else what does he mean to prove by his appeal to Cyprian? That this verse was genuine? But if it already existed in all the copies, if it were acknowledged both by orthodox and Arians, where was the use or sense of strengthening this general consent by the

solitary evidence of Cyprian? Clarke,¹ quoting Justin for a passage, which I shall hereafter mention, adds, that no doubt Justin found it in the old Greek translation. Is it not clear from this appeal to Justin's authority, that the passage is not in the present copies of the Greek translation? Would Fulgentius have said, "De Patre et seipso et Spiritu Sancto testatur ipse Filius dicens, Ite, docete, &c. (Matth. xxviii. 19.) Quod etiam beatissimus martyr Cyprianus confitetur," &c. Certainly never; or if he had said it, he would weaken a part of the evidence which we now have for the authenticity of that text. But Fulgentius being aware of an objection that the verse was not then extant in St. John's epistle, shields himself under the authority of Cyprian, and quotes the passage for genuine scripture, on this maxim, (which Facundus also adopts, though he applies it in a different way,) that Cyprian was infallible. Nor was he singular in this maxim, but agreed with the general opinion that prevailed after Cyprian's martyrdom. For, as Mosheim² well observes, Cyprian's reputation was so enhanced by his fortitude in suffering a violent death, that he became the common master and oracle of the church. The merits of the martyr threw a shade over the defects of the author, and the veneration that ought to have been confined to his piety, was extended to his writings. It was therefore no wonder that Fulgentius should accept a reading which he supposed to be Cyprian's reading of a passage in scripture; or that Facundus should accept an interpretation which he supposed to be Cyprian's interpretation of scripture. In either case they were sure of vanquishing their enemies by an authority which it was deemed blasphemy to resist.

I think it most probable, that Cyprian in these quotations followed, as he thought, the authority of Tertullian. Finding the phrase, *tres unum sunt*, closely joined to, "*quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus*," he took the former part of the sentence to be a quotation from scripture as well as the latter. "But from what part of scripture," would Cyprian say, "could my master take it, except 1 John v. 8.?" I perceive his drift; he interprets the spirit, the water and the blood, of the three persons of the Trinity, and to them applies the concluding words, *the three are one*. If such an allegorical interpretation once entered Cyprian's head, it would recommend itself to his approbation equally by its own intrinsic merit and the authority of his master. I pay no compliment to De Missy, when I say that he had a clearer

¹ Reply to Waterland, p. 135.

² *Incredibile dictum est, quantum per universum orbem Christianum, post mortem pro Christo magno animo exceptam, auctoritatem adeptus sit, ut communis instar magistri et oraculi loco haberetur. De Rebus Christianis ante Constantinum M. Sec. iii. § xxiv. p. 597.*

and more critical head than Cyprian. Yet he took Bengelius's words for a quotation from Stephens.¹ Tertullian proves by some curious reasons (*de Jejun.* § 10.) that Daniel's hours of prayer were the third, the sixth, and the ninth. Cyprian lays his hands on this piece of news as a great prize, and turns it to good account. The passage I have quoted above. He there not only asserts this as a fact of Daniel, but adds his three companions, and infers that it denoted the mystery of the Trinity, which was to be revealed in the last times. I wish you had transcribed a little more from Fulgentius in your Appendix. He has borrowed this argument from Cyprian, and I think (but I may be partial) somewhat improved it. After his first citation from Cyprian, he thus proceeds: "For in his book on the Lord's prayer, to show that the Trinity is of one Deity, without any difference of the persons, he relates that Daniel and the children were wont to pray at intervals of three hours; where by the revolution of *three* hours, to the duty of *one* prayer, he evidently shows, that the Trinity is one God."

I shall now request the reader once more diligently to peruse the passage of Eucherius above quoted. If Eucherius had found in any of his followers as constant a reader and zealous an admirer as Tertullian found in Cyprian, how natural would it be for such a follower, on reading this place, to mistake the sentence, "*Ergo Pater ex quo omnia, Filius per quem omnia, Spiritus Sanctus in quo omnia,*" for a formal quotation of 1 Cor. viii. 6. He would infer, (and he would infer with as much justice as you and others have made Tertullian's words a quotation) that by the "*sicut et apostolus dicit,*" Eucherius meant, not to defend his own expression by a similar passage of scripture, but to connect two similar passages. All the difference is, that the "*sicut et,*" is stronger than Tertullian's "*quomodo.*" Or to draw up my argument in form of an abstract proposition; if an author states his own doctrine in language resembling some words of scripture, and illustrates it by a scriptural quotation, it is probable that some credulous reader will take the author's own words for his reading of that part of scripture to which they bear a resemblance.

Gregory Nazianzen's father left behind him some discourses on the Trinity. In one of these, after proving his thesis from several texts, he proceeded in these words: 'Εστὶν ὁν Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, ὁ Υἱός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα, καθὼς καὶ γέγραπται, 'Εξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.² (*Rom. xi. 36.*) Gregory, on the perusal of this passage, turned over his New Testament, and at last found in 1 Cor. viii. 6. this sentence: *To us there is one God the Father, from whom are all*

¹ Letter IV. p. 99.

² I have adopted the reading of the Vulgate, for an obvious reason.

things—and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. He therefore judiciously concluded, that his father read the whole verse thus : *To us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and we from him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him ; and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things, and we in him.* With this opinion, could he forget to employ his new-found text in his disputes with the heretics ? Either his reverence for his father's memory, or the singular fitness of the passage for his purpose, would alone be a sufficient motive ; united, they were irresistible. In his thirty-ninth oration, therefore, p. 630. C. he quotes the verse with this addition, compares it with Rom. xi, 36. and argues from it as if both heretics and orthodox allowed it to be genuine. His commentator, Nicetas, T. ii. Orat. xxxix. p. 1026. B. xlv. p. 1249. A. twice follows this reading, and urges it against the Arians, adding in the latter place, “ *Neque enim alioqui Trinitas fuerit, nisi Spiritus quoque connumeretur ;*” which, as Mr. Matthæi¹ rightly remarks, is an unwary confession of fraud. Three Ms. Scholiasts agree in the same reading, and one has the impudence to affirm that it was erased by Arius. Ἐξελήφθη παρὰ τοῦ Ἀρείου. (read ἐξηλεφθῆ.) From Gregory it passed to John Damascenus, who quotes it several times, to Euthymius Zigabenus, and to Emanuel Calecas.² From Grègory or John Damascenus (for both, I believe, were early translated into Slavonic) it crept into the Slavonian version, and is in the Mss. and first editions, but omitted in the latter.

I acknowledge that I have mixed a little romance with the beginning of this story. But I was willing for once to imitate your way of setting down your own fancies for positive facts. The intelligent reader will however see that I have supposed nothing but what is probable. I take Gregory to have been deceived by finding in some eminent Greek Father³ a sentence similar to that which I have quoted from Eucherius. My hypothesis too is very charitable ; for I was willing to bring off my favorite Gregory with the least possible loss of honour. I have pointed out the real source of the mistake, though I cannot trace its progress, nor discover through what channels it flowed into Gregory's oration.

If an admirer of Gregory, writing on the deity of the Holy Spirit, used these words : “The blessed apostle Paul testifies, that ‘to us there is one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things,’ which also the most pious bishop Gregory the divine declares

¹ Animadvers. ad 1 Cor. viii. 6. p. 204—210.

² De Principiis Fidei, c. 3. p. 215. ed. Coteler. whom Mr. Matthæi seems to have overlooked.

³ How easily this might happen, will appear from the following passage of Epiphanius, Hæc. lxxvi. 69. p. 691. Οὐδαίς· γὰρ ἐν ἑτέρῳ θείῳ—ἀλλὰ εἰς Πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἰς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα, αἱ οὐραὶ ἡ τριὰς, μία ἡ θείατης.

(confitetur) in his oration of the holy lights, where, to demonstrate the Trinity, he has brought the following proofs directly from scripture: *To us there is one God the Father, &c.* where the *from whom* and *by whom* and *in whom* do not separate the natures—as is clear, if we attentively read in the same Apostle, *from him and by him and in him are all things, &c.*” would not he confess, that he was indebted for the knowledge of this text to Gregory Nazianzen, and to him only? The plain English of such an appeal would be: This sentence is wanting in our present copies; but Gregory, whose fidelity and accuracy cannot be questioned, had it in his Ms., as appears from his quoting it. So Fulgentius’s testimony amounts to no more than this: The verse is not now indeed in the epistle, but it was there in Cyprian’s days, for he quotes it, and to suspect him either of fraud or mistake would be the height of impiety.

The implicit faith with which the Latin writers copy their predecessors, often diminishes and sometimes destroys the value of their testimony. Thus a gloss crept early into some copies of John iii. 6. “*Et quoniam Deus Spiritus est, de Deo natus est.*” I believe Tertullian to be the author of this gloss, who sometimes blends the words of scripture with his own, so that it requires much skill and pains to make the separation. From him it quickly spread through all the Latin churches, “*Ceu flamma per tædas, vel Euris Per Siculas equitavit undas.*” It would be idle to recount all the writers who quote this for scripture; but some, not content with asserting it to be genuine, charge the Arians with having corrupted the copies that omitted it. Hear the holy Ambrose: “This place you Arians so expressly testify to be written of the Spirit, that you erase it from your books. And I wish you erased it only from your own, and not from the public books of the church.” Observe the candor and judgment of this saint. He acknowledges that a passage is wanting in almost all the Mss. and founds his accusation of the Arians on the very circumstance that ought to have acquitted them. The same calumny is repeated by Bede, Fulbert and Hincmar, who “follow in the chase, not like hounds that hunt, but like those that fill up the cry.” I must not forget to add, that Grabe¹ defends the genuineness of this interpolation, and very properly in company with 1 John v. 7. “The heifer hath calved and hath not calved.” Pray, Sir, in what part of scripture may this passage be found? It is quoted by at least four of the Fathers. Tertullian² says, “We read in

¹ Not. ad Bulli Defens. Fid. Nic. p. 139. “Græbius vir bonus nec indoctus fuit et in scriptis Patrum apprime versatus; criticus non fuit, neque esse potuit, ut pote neque ingenio neque iudicio—satis ad eam rem instructus.” Thirlby Dedicat. to Justin Martyr.

² De Carne Christi, § 23.

Ezekiel." Clemens Alexandrinus¹ says simply, "in scripture." Gregory Nyssen² and Epiphanius³ seem to quote it from Isaiah. There is some difference in the words, but they all agree in the application, which, I suppose, I need not mention.

Justin Martyr tells Trypho, that the Jews have corrupted their scripture to elude the prophecies relating to the Messiah. One of his examples is Psalm xcvi. 10. from which three words, says Justin, have been erased by the Jews, so that the true reading is, "The Lord hath reigned from the tree." Thirlby in his note produces an host of witnesses for the same reading, to whom he might have added the author against Varimadus iii. 2. This reading, though manifestly false and spurious, has crept into some Psalters, and seems to have imposed on Erasmus, who cites it without suspicion in his colloquy intitled, *Inquistio de Fide*.

These interpolations, which are well known to the learned, I have produced merely to teach the superficial reader not to place too much confidence in the citations of the Fathers. We have seen how Nicetas, though he was sensible that authority was against him, retains and defends Gregory Nazianzen's reading. We have seen how Justin Martyr and Ambrose, when they wanted to promote a passage to the rank of scripture, reproached their adversaries with having erased it.

You suppose "*authenticæ literæ*" in Tertullian to signify the autographs of the apostles. This construction you support by a passage from Ignatius, which I profess not to understand; but I am sure that it will not admit the sense you put on it. You then refer us to Peter⁴ of Alexandria, who testifies, it seems, that the original Gospel of St. John was kept at Ephesus in his time. Are you really ignorant, Sir, that this Peter is an author, whose age, name and credit are totally uncertain? And Berriman⁵ and Ernesti⁶ think that "*authenticæ*" means no more than genuine, un-interpolated. But I flatter myself that I can confirm your interpretation from Tertullian himself,⁷ who quotes the "*originale instrumentum Moysi*." Now if Tertullian had seen the "original volume of Moses," how much more easily might he have seen the original epistle of John? Nor is it wonderful that the autograph of Moses should last to the present day. For Montfaucon⁸ saw at Bologna an Hebrew Ms. which, as appeared from a memorandum

¹ Strom. vii. p. 756.

² In Zacagni's Collectan. Monument. Vet. p. 303.

³ Hæres. xxx. 30. p. 156.

⁴ Petavius Uranolog. p. 397.

⁵ Dissert. on 1 Tim. iii. 16. p. 13.

⁶ Opusc. Philolog. et Crit. p. 308.

⁷ Contra Hermog. § 19.

⁸ Diar. Ital. p. 400.

in the middle of the book, was written by Esdras's own proper hand.

But to leave this solemn trifling, and return to the question. The words of Tertullian, which you have taken for a quotation from scripture, I think I have shown to be only a deduction of his own from two texts John x. 30. xvi. 14. Phœbadius copies Tertullian. Cyprian finding two or three words, which happen to follow in the same order, 1 John v. 8. immediately succeeded by a formal quotation from scripture, thought these words also to be a quotation, and employed them without remorse in the sense which, as he imagined, his master had affixed to them. Thus Tertullian¹ proves by some ingenious arguments, that Daniel's three hours of prayer were the third, the sixth, and the ninth. Then comes Cyprian, takes the fact for granted, asserts the same of Daniel's three companions, and hence elicits the mystery of the Trinity. Whoever could argue at this rate, could with equal or greater ease find the same doctrine in such an expression as "the three are one," though the literal sense seemed ever so foreign to his subject.

Two or three centuries afterwards both Facundus and Fulgentius appealed to this passage of Cyprian. Neither of them could find a text of scripture, where it was expressly said of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, "these three are one." Yet Cyprian seemed to affirm it. Facundus therefore supposed, that Cyprian mixed his own interpretation with the words of scripture. Fulgentius on the other hand, being somewhat more sanguine, supposed that he quoted literally the words of scripture. Finding therefore a kind of counterpart to Cyprian's quotation in 1 John v. 8. he would naturally conclude that the three heavenly witnesses were distinctly mentioned in Cyprian's copy, but had afterwards vanished, either by the malice of the Arians, or the negligence of the scribes, confounding the homœoteleuta. If you think, Sir, that it derogates from the honor of Cyprian or Fulgentius to insinuate that they could, in matters of such importance, blindly follow their leaders; you ought to recollect that I pass no harsher censure on them than I have passed on you with respect to Martin; a censure, whose justice you cannot help feeling in your mind, whether you choose to confess it or not.

POSTSCRIPT.

1. I have perhaps been much more diffuse on this article than was necessary. But I remember, that when I was a novice in this controversy, I was very angry with the opposers of the heavenly witnesses for their obstinacy in denying Cyprian's words to be a

literal quotation. My reasons for the opinion which gave birth to my indignation* were chiefly two. 1. My esteem for the learning, good sense and fidelity of the fathers, which would not suffer me to believe, that they would quote negligently or interpret absurdly. 2. My reliance on the candor of the disputants in stating the adversary's arguments. But experience has instructed me to entertain more moderate and qualified sentiments of both parties.

2. Mr. Travis has taken particular care not to let the reader know, that the passage so triumphantly urged, as a direct quotation of 1 John v. 7. is cited at length by Facundus, and expressly declared by him to be an interpretation of 1 John v. 8. But from Mr. Travis's representation of the matter, you would believe that Facundus refers in general terms to Cyprian, without specifying the exact place.

3. Scipio Maffei¹ asserts that Facundus alludes to the seventh verse. But because he makes in the same page several other assertions totally ungrounded, (such as that the verse is in Aldus's edition, that Mill allows it to be extant in other Greek Mss. not less ancient than the Alexandrian, &c.) I shall conclude that in this instance, as well as the others, he asserted what he wished rather than what he knew.

4. I have written *de Unitate* in Facundus, and thus disabled an objection which might otherwise be made, that Facundus cannot be safely trusted, because he refers to Cyprian's treatise by a wrong title, *de Trinitate*. But learned men have long since conjectured, *de Unitate*, which might indeed have been admitted into the text, though it were not confirmed by the Verona Ms. in Maffei, p. 145.

5. Mr. Travis has read Tertullian so diligently and understands him so well, that he denies, p. 233—235, Tertullian to have been a Montanist, when he wrote his treatise against Praxeas. A proper man this to confute Newton!

EXTRACTS FROM NEGLECTED BOOKS.

No. IV.—[Continued from No. LXXIV.]

Prognostica, sive Practica, Perpetua. Dissertatio de Cornelio, et ejusdem Natura ac Proprietate. (Printed at the end of a volume containing the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum," &c. Frankfurt, 1644.)

MOST of our readers are probably acquainted with the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum:" to such as are not, we re-

¹ Opuscoli Ecclesiastici, p. 174. published with his *Istoria Teologica*.

commend them, as a rich fund of grave humor, and well-directed, though now somewhat obsolete, satire, levelled against certain enemies of learning in the German universities of the sixteenth century. It is not with the "Epistolæ" themselves, however, that we are now concerned. The celebrity of this work appears to have rendered it, like the *Rolliad* in later times, a nucleus, round which the scattered *jeux d'esprit* of German wit might gather themselves. Accordingly, in some of the later editions they are followed by a long retinue of pieces, chiefly humorous, many of them bearing little or no relation to the Reuchlinian controversy. Two of these, contained in the small thick volume before us, appear to us to possess no common merit in their way; and from these we propose making copious extracts, for the benefit of those of our readers, who are philosophers enough to consider one more source of honest and hearty mirth as an acquisition.

The first, "*Prognostica Perpetua*," or a set of astrological predictions for 1592 and all succeeding years, is a piece of quiet irony, so strongly resembling in its subject and manner some of Swift's Miscellanies, as to lead to the conjecture that the latter may have been suggested by the former,—even as one good thing often serves as the hint and ground-work of another still better. The preface is certainly very much in the spirit of the Dean.

"*Honesto et circumspecto viro, Joanni Gartnero, &c. &c.*"

"*Quotannis quidam ex siderum ratione ac motu, terrestrium metiuntur futuros effectus, idque postea literis mandantes, publice omnibus legendum exhibent. Illos autem sapissime in judicio suo falsos esse videmus; adeo quod vulgus nunc illorum scripta mendaciorum libellos palam vocitare audeat. Superioribus autem diebus quidam, nescio quis, sed profecto homo industrius, exiguum edidit opusculum, quod Prognostica recte et Latine vocamus, a barbaris vero, inepto vocabulo, Practica nuncupatur. Quo libello perlecto, nihil falsi usquam in eo deprehendere potui, nihilque quod non futurum sit, invenire licet. Ita bonus ille homo cuncta, quæ vera sunt, narrare studuit. Ob id ego, opusculum Teutonica lingua scriptum, Latinitate donare volui, ut id ipsum non Germani tantum, sed et cæteræ nationes legerent,*" &c.

Of the "*Predictions*" to which our favor is thus bespoken, some are, it must be confessed, rather coarse, and others contain allusions unintelligible to readers of another age and country. Enough, however, remains for a reasonably copious selection, to which we shall proceed without further comment;

and if any of our readers should be disposed to censure us for occupying the pages of the *Classical Journal* with such frivolities, ("magister Ortuinus non curat istas fantasias,") we must beg leave to refer him to the last number of the *Nugæ*, which he will find more serious, and not near so entertaining.

Cap. I.—Aureus numerus hoc anno parvus erit, et modicus apud pauperes.

Multæ futuræ sunt illo anno tenebræ medio noctis, præsertim tempestate.

Scarificare, et sanguinem minuere, bonum est et utile, quoties hominem necessitas ad hoc impulerit. Vitanda tamen maxime sanguinis minutio, quæ sit a rusticis circa festa bacchanalia, dum sullis farciminibus repleti sunt.

In Martio, aliisque temporibus, utilia scabiosis balnea, et unguenta, fricatio quoque illis erit non ingrata.

In mense Julio vna ex frigidioribus cellariis allata, sitientibus sunt jucundissima.

In Decembri autem tunicæ, jumentorum pellibus suffultæ, stomacho, et toti ventri sunt optimæ.

Mercatores omnibus mensibus, nisi ami argentique virtute muniti fuerint, in alienas regiones navigare diligenter caveant.

(This appears to be a parody on the pompous inanity of the rules for the preservation of health, &c. given in the popular almanacks.)

Cap. III.—De Principum valetudine.

Principes, præsentī anno, sibi caveant a gravibus morbis, tum enim sani et bene validi manebunt. Quod si minus fecerint, timeendum, ubi morbus invaluerit, quosdam eorum morituros esse.

Cap. IV.—De Abbatibus.

Abbates magnam habebunt nobilium familiaritatem ac etiam opem, in evacuandis vasis vinariis, parum autem contra adversarios præsidii.¹ Plura præterea Abbates monachis vetabunt, quæ tamen ipsimet licenter et impune acturi sunt.

Cap. VII.—De Vino et Cerevisia.

Nihil aut parum vini horuo anno colligetur in sylva Hercinia. In aliis vero pluribus locis copiam vini dabunt vites, et quidem suavissimi, bibituque delectabilis. Multis autem vinum erroneam vitam faciet, fæcesque supra et infra egeret. Magnas

¹ Ita correximus pro præsidium. Scribl. Jun.

item discordias et seditiones Bacchus excitabit : plures de sedibus, scamnis, et scalis præcipitabit.¹

Cap. XI.—De Equitibus, Peditibus, ac cæteris Militibus.

Milites et equites hastarum ludo, exercitatione, jocosum quærent. In venationibus faventem habebunt fortunam plerique eorum : multos *cuculos* capient, vitamque suam ita instituent, rebusque suis provide consulent, ne aliquis caupo debitor eorum maneat.

Cap. XII.—De Magistris Artium, Scholasticis, Discipulisque studentibus.

Illi jucundam, hoc anno, vitam ducent . . . Eorum autem multi magnam patientur pecuniæ penuriam. Ita tamen vivent, quod magis anxii erunt eorum creditores, quomodo pecuniam debitam extorqueant, quam ipsi, quomodo solvant. Secure posses apud eos scientiam deponere. Nemo enim eam apud hosce quærere conabitur : nec ipsi curiose, quid ejusmodi apud se depositum sit, investigabunt.

Cap. XV.—De Mulieribus et Virginibus.

Mulieres et virgines debiles erunt, et brevis memoriæ, et prolixorum crinium. Uxores, hoc anno, communiter viris suis imperitabunt, maritisque multa (quanquam non omnia de Deo) concionabuntur. Meretrices vetulæ bonæ, imo optimæ, erunt amasiorum internunciæ. Præterea, de quibusdam magna erit suspicio, quod sint honestæ, aut etiam virgines, quibus fit injuria ; libenter tamen hanc suspicionem passuræ sunt.

Cap. XVIII.—De communi Plebe.

Calcearii, sartores, pelliones, opificesque reliqui et propolæ, multa mentientur, et hæc lucri causa facturi sunt. Pecuniæ tamen penuria, hoc anno, multas emptiones impedit ; pecunia enim inæqualiter inter homines, præsentis anno, dividetur.

Cap. XIX.—De variis nationibus.

Ungari et Poloni plura bella hornotino habebunt anno, quia magnorum pediculorum erit frequentia. Misnenses, Turingi, et Saxones, parva pocula fastidient, modicumque cerevisiæ vitabunt usum. Constantia magnas habebit afflictiones propter murium

¹ "Great political changes and commotions may be expected about this time; certain powerful individuals will be precipitated from their lofty stations."—Francis Moore, *passim*.

glitiumque multitudinem. Tubingæ medicum pecuniæ cito consumetur.

Cap. XXII.--De quorundam hominum Penuria.

Magna erit sacerdotum penuria, *ideo quod quidam tria, quatuorve, aut plura habebunt Ecclesiastica officia*. . . .

We proceed to the dissertation "*De Cornelio*." The question here occurs—Who was Cornelius? and what were the doings, or qualities, that entitled him to the honor of a set treatise? An explanation will be given in the course of the following extract. In what college, club-room, or coterie, this whimsical phrase originated, it were vain to inquire.

"Quid autem sit Cornelius, et unde dictus, variæ sunt literatorum sententiæ; nullaque adeo facultas est, quam non strenue Cornelius hic exerceat.

"Theologi quidem in sacris bibliis hanc quæstionem non attingi affirmant, nec esse in talibus admodum inquirendum, cum plus satis sit, si rem ipsam habeamus. Qui enim Cornelium habet, non multum sollicitus est de substantia aut nomine ejus, quum retro ad causam ejus ut plurimum oculos flectit.

"Jurisperitis Cornelius est defectus pecuniæ, qui ei, qui multum debet, facultatem satisfaciendi eripit, et eundem subterfugere facit, sicut et fugitivus indidem nuncupatur, in l. 5, C. de recept. arbit. Verum hæc definitio cum nimis sit angusta, recte exploditur a Don Anton. de Crampaiguis tract. de fum. et flam. c. 6, n. 194.

"Neque vero cum Medicis facimus, asserentibus, Cornelium esse passionem animi, quæ contraria causa reprimitur: nec enim semper contrario repellitur Cornelius: quod videre est in irato verberato rustico adversarium suum demulcente pugnis, quem certe Cornelium habere nemo ibit inficias: hic si pulsaretur ab eo quem nunc castigat, eo usque per hoc contrarium Cornelius ejus non tolleretur, ut etiam augetur.

"Philosophorum opinionem, quamvis communem dicat Plato, nos rejicimus: ne tamen quid neglexissè videamur, etiam hic referemus. Existimant illi, Cornelium esse nomen inane sine re, ortum ex festivitate quapiam: cum enim in comico ludo quidam Cornelii nomine, Conscientiæ personam sustinuisset, isque ex scenis prodians, chorum semper lætum inventum, subinde digrediens tristem ac mœiore plenum reliquisset, abuisse has affectuum vices in proverbium, ut quoties quis solito mœstior esset, diceretur Cornelium habere. At hæc sententia communiter improbat, cum aliter in praxi edoceamur. Nos igitur, utpote qui nulli facultati nos mœcipamus, (similes enim sumus

Achilli illi Persco, qui de omnibus materiis aque feliciter dissecabat,) censemus, Cornelium nec hominem simpliciter esse, nec spiritum. Omnino enim cum Lactantio statumus duo esse Demonum genera, coelestes et terrestres: et putamus, Cornelium esse spiritum corporeum ex atræ bilis copia conflatum, qui certis exacerbatus causis hominem inquietat. Unde Germanicum illud huiusmodi esse, quoties Corneliosum quem contuentur, ut dicant, *Er schlägt sich mit dem teuffel*.

“Derivato nomine a Græco *κορέω*, id est, satio seu saturo, et *νηλῆς*, id est, immisericors seu crudelis, dicitur Cornelius quasi *κορέων νηλεῶς*, id est, crudeliter satians. Testatum enim experientia facit, eos qui hac peste onerantur, ita inhumaniter excipi, ut per unicum modo diem laborantes jam tum ceperit Corneli satietas.”

‘Cornelius,’ therefore, may be considered as nearly synonymous with ‘the blue devils.’ In the mock pomp, affected research, and far-fetched derivations of the above passage, our readers will have no difficulty in recognising a sportive burlesque on the pedantry which at that time overgrew literature like a weed. Of Cornelius, thus defined, the author treats right scientifically. We give an extract or two; premising only, that here, as elsewhere, we have made a few alterations and omissions for convenience sake.

“*Causam efficientem si quærimus, non matrem esse reperimus, idque hac in materia mirum esse monet Hypocras Guldore de sect. venat. c. 7. Cum enim alias unus filius uno saltem patre possit gigni, hic tamen unus filius, id est, Cornelius, pluribus ex causis, iisque separatis, nascitur. Pro varietate autem temporum et locorum, personarum item et circumstantiarum, aliam atque aliam materiam agnoscit Cornelius. In his enim est ex defectu pecuniæ: in aliis ex amore: in aliis ex crapula: in aliis ex verberibus: in aliis ex chartis lusoriis: in aliis ex melancholici humoris ebullitione, &c. Sic nonnullos Cornelius invadit tempore matutino cum surgendum est, quo tempore etiam meditationes suscipi consueverunt de solœcismo pridie per vinum commissio: quosdam vespertino tempore, cum caupo se diutius potum daturum renuit: alios post meridiem, quando ab amica in horto ad urbem redeundum: alios media nocte, cum ad caveam, sive ut Romani loquuntur, ad carcerem migrandum. Pari ratione quidam in conclavi suo Cornelium sentiunt, dum labores, libros, præceptores, et id genus nugarum inveniunt, nullos autem computatores aut confabulantes: quidam in templo, dura concio nimium protrahitur, &c. &c.*”

“*Materia Corneli ex definitione colligitur: cum enim humidum radicale sit tenue, et calor natus imbecillior, oritur spi-*

ritus quidam siccus et frigidus, ater, tristis, raro subsidens, sui impositus, qualitercumque condensatus et incorporatus, et breviter, tale monstrum, cui nec Homericus Polyphemus, nec Virgiliana Fama, nec Ovidiani gigantes, nec Horatiana pictura, nec ullum vel a Wigoleisio, vel a Scufrido, vel ab Amadiso, vel a quopiam necessariorum ejus, debellatum portentum, comparari queat.

“*Formam* Cornelii intuentibus, pro diversis subjectis in quibus dominatur, varie se instar Protei manifestat. Quidam enim hominum consortia fugientes ad loca solitaria properant: alii versantur quidem cum mortalibus, sed taciturni, cerui, morosi, quibus dici solet, eos calendaria componere, aut speculari divina, aut claves querere, aut Cornelium habere, quorum postremum prioribus tribus verius nos existimamus: nonnulli, presentibus aliis, ubique recursis spatius deambulant,

‘Spectantes terram, manibus post terga rejectis,’ et succincentes sibi melancholico murmure, cujus harmoniam nec ipsi, nec alii, sed solus qui eos vexat Cornelius intelligere potest. *Objectum* Cornelii sunt res, actiones et verba. Res, ut calcei, vestes, uxor, ligna, candelæ, sanitas, morbus, vinum, virgines, cerevisia, compotatores, corivales, pulices, pediculi, quamque primo decuisset loco poni, pecunia, et similes. Actiones, ut si quis cucurbitari se novit, quod tamen mutari nequit: si patientiam Socratis addiscere quis teneatur: si quem pulices infestant, ubi capere dedecet: si puella superciliosa, quæ se Dianam aut Junonem esse credit, ne nimis demissa aut humilis videatur, pro cum suum asperius repudiavit, quem tamen perditæ amat, et reverti iterum atque instare tacite exoptat; ille vero nihil de ea sollicitus, aliam, quod aiunt, quercum excutit. Verbo, ut si lepus quidam, cui cor in caligis, Thrasonis alicujus minis perterrefactus, pacem et requiem emit, aliquot Joachimicis, aut duccatis, aut florenis in convivium commune exhibitis; memoret istius Maronis *Æn.* xi. Nulla salus bello, pacem te poscimus omnes: et illius sacri, Pacem inter vos alite, *Marc.* 9, 24, &c.”

Second thoughts, says a Cambridge prize poem, are best; and as we feel some misgivings lest what has amused us should not be equally amusing to some of our readers—lest, in short, we should be unintentionally instrumental in inflicting Cornelius on them, we have determined to shorten our extracts, and conclude with a few of the “Corollaria” subjoined to this curious tractate:—

Cor. Grammaticum. An Cornelius possit declinari? Affirmamus, præterquam in genitivo casu, (the case, we presume, of such as are born of a Cornelious temperament,) quem non putamus esse declinabilem.

Dialecticum. An Cornelius in homine habeat respectum subjecti occupantis, an subjecti occupati? Posterius affirmamus: nam falsum est, quod vulgus dicitur non habere Cornelium. Nos enim Cornelium non habemus, sed Cornelius nos habet.

Musicum. Cornelius licet per omnes declinabiles casus possit cani, suavissimus tamen in ablativo statuitur; ibi namque vim suam exerit Lydius, teste Cassiodoro 2. variar. 40.

Astronomicum. Cui signo conveniat Cornelius in zodiaco? respondemus, Capricorno per omnia.

Juridicum. An Cornelius possit contra Corneliosum agere interdicto Uti possidetis? Negamus, quia Cornelius vi possidet, cui non datur hoc interdictum. l. 1, §. ult. ff. Uti possidet.

Physicum. Cornelium augmenti et decrementi esse capacem, atque ita subiacere alterationi, arbitramur, contra Aristotelem de generat. et corrupt. lib. 3, c. 33.

Philologicum. Dubitatum meminimus, uter sit natura prior, ipsene Cornelius, an vero Corneliosus. Hunc esse priorem statuimus, tanquam subjectum adjuncto suo.

Historicum. An C. Cæsar, cum acceptis vulneribus veste faciem tegeret jam moriturus, Cornelium habuerit? Negamus: est enim hoc Cornelii genus irregulare.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF HISTORY.

“—Truth severe in fairy fiction drest.”

THE persecutions of Alva and of Louis the XIVth had a sensible effect on English commerce; for we date the prosperity of our woollen manufactures from the arrival of the Flemings, and our silk trade from the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Yet if the trade of Flanders and France had been united, it would by no means have justified such a description as has been given of the trade of Tyre—a description, which is not in the language of flattery or of praise, but of inspiration.¹ Neither was the ruin of the trade of Tyre a partial ruin; the city itself fell after a very long and very severe siege, and its fall and the dispersion of its inhabitants was effected by the same mighty monarch who destroyed Jerusalem, and who conquered and dispersed the

¹ See Isaiah chap. xviii, and Ezekiel chap. xxvii.

Elamites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Egyptians.¹ What then was the effect of conquests and dispersions to which history can furnish no parallel? To say that they had no effect, is to say but little in favor of our philosophy and political economy, and to contradict the sure word of prophecy: to say that their effect is still to be found, is to acknowledge that the search may be successful, and that our time will not be utterly wasted in making it.

Let us begin by trying to discover the true sense of those words in which Isaiah mentions the songs of Tyre. "After the end of seventy years shall Tyre sing as an harlot."² Take an harp, go about the city, thou harlot, that hast been forgotten; make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered."

What are we to understand by these expressions? If, as we have been told, they allude to the revival of the commerce of Tyre, the metaphor does not seem very apt, for the noise and bustle of a sea-port have little resemblance to sweet melody; neither does it seem very necessary, as mention is afterwards made of her merchandize and her hire. Yet if we take the expressions in a more literal sense, where shall we find the songs of Tyre? The greatest part of our information concerning Tyre is derived from the Holy Scriptures: her restoration was prophesied and accomplished; but, from the time of Ezekiel to her final ruin by Alexander, we find nothing of the sweet melody and many songs which are mentioned by Isaiah. Perhaps a little attention to one word may remove our uncertainty. The songs were to be as the songs of a harlot, sweet, but false, perverting and disguising the truth; and they may therefore be found in the fabulous history of the Greeks: for we should bear in mind that the fabulous history of the Greeks, notwithstanding its contradictions, and impurities, and absurdities, must have had some foundation; it is an invention, and not a creation: for that "nothing can come of nothing," will always be true when applied to man. We may add, and pervert, and falsify, and embellish; but we must have some material to work on—we cannot create: the wildest dream that was ever dreamt may be traced to an origin. The cause and the effect may be as unlike as the acorn and the oak; but fabulous history, and every other lie that was ever invented, was made out of something. Without further preface, therefore, let us attempt to reconcile the Bellerophon of fable, with that history which was given by inspiration, and which is true in all its particulars.

The Bellerophon of Homer is mentioned in an episode; but

¹ See Jeremiah, chapters xvi. xvii. xlviii. and xlv.

² But see the marginal translation of our Bible.

his adventures are related with so much circumstance, that we may appear to act unwarrantably in considering them as a perversion of the truth. Mitford, however, has gone still farther, in asserting that Sisyphus, Glaucus, and Bellerophon, are "names to which poetry has given fame, but not delivered down to us as objects of history;" and in neither mentioning nor allowing room for Prætus among the kings of Argos, and, as well as I can discover, in making no provision for Diomed, Sthenelus, and Euryalus.¹ We may, therefore, allow ourselves to pass over all smaller matters in the story of Bellerophon, and to confine our attention to the striking features which seem peculiar to him as an individual. We may collect from Homer, that Bellerophon came from a distant country; that he brought letters or tokens, the meaning of which was concealed from him, and which contained an order for his destruction; that he subdued a monster, which breathed fire, and had a lion's head, a goat's body, and a serpent's tail; that he conquered the Solymi and the Amazons; and that in the latter part of his life he experienced very great misery. To this account other authors added, that he caught the winged horse Pegasus; that he attempted to fly up to heaven, and was cast down. Let us begin by attempting to discover what this monster or chimæra really was.

A burning mountain is still to be found in Lycia; and if we suppose that lions lived at the top of it, and goats in the middle, and serpents at the bottom, we shall have the usual explanation of the Chimæra. As for Bellerophon's conquering it, that is quite another matter. If the volcano still exists, we may infer that Bellerophon did not put it out; and if all the heroes of the present day were to try, they would probably do nothing more than burn their own fingers. On the other hand, if goats are put between lions and serpents, we shall not want any hero at all to deliver us from the goats. Let us then consider this monster as the fabulous emblem of three kingdoms. If we put the lion for Judah, we shall have the support of Scripture. Jupiter was nursed by a goat; Minerva's shield, or ægis, was covered with a goat's skin; Pan's lower half was that of a goat; and Egypt is represented as the mother of idolatry. If we infer from these circumstances that Egypt was represented by the goat, our inference will derive some support from etymology; for in *Ægis* and *Egypt*, or, to use the Greek characters, in *Αἰγίς* and *Αἴγυπτος*, we may trace a similarity. The dragon, or fiery serpent, may in like manner be made to allude to Ethiopia; which we may derive from two Greek words, the one

¹ See the second section of his first chapter

signifying fiery, and the other a serpent; so that the Chumara may stand for the three kingdoms of Judah, Egypt, and Ethiopia. The reader may startle at such an explanation; and his surprise will be increased by his being told, that in bad puns and in mistakes he must be content to find an explanation of many fables, which are thought to contain very elegant and tasteful allegories.

But why should the reader have taken for granted that Greek nature was very different from English nature, and that men are not the same in the same circumstances? A lion tearing a cock was thought a fit emblem of the victories of Marlborough; an *H* and an *arrow* are still recognised as an emblem of Harrow School. What are these but bad puns? As for mistakes, do we not laugh at the French for the gross blunders which they make in English names; and was it very wonderful that an Englishman, who did not understand French, confounded *bras d'or* with *brass door*? A little reflection may perhaps convince the reader that blunders were very common in classical times: even now the lower classes will be found to turn a name which they do not understand into something that is familiar to them. The Bellerophon of classical literature is the *Billy rough-one* of the sailor; the *Bien-faisant* is turned into the *bonny pheasant*; the Boulogne mouth is represented by *a bull and a mouth*; the Mantichora is the *man-tiger*; and if the geologist searches for oyster-shells in Oyster-hill, the antiquary will correct his mistake by telling him that we have confounded *oyster* and *Ostorius*.

Such then being the case in modern times, let us not fancy that they who spoke in Greek or Latin could make no blunders, because they spoke in Greek or Latin; but let us rather be guided by human nature, and admit that if a cock is an emblem of France or Gallia, the Chimæra¹ may be an emblem of three kingdoms which Bellerophon conquered.

In the Solymi, who fought so fiercely, we may recognise either the people of Elam, or the nation "terrible from the beginning," whose capital was Salem, or Solyma. The Amazons of Homer differ from the Amazons of later authors, for every story gains in telling. The Priam of the Iliad is mentioned not as the ally, but as the enemy of the Amazons; and nothing is said by Homer to hinder us from supposing that his

¹ If Chimæra relates to fire, it is probably derived from the same root as *shems*, the Arabic word for sun; but I suspect that *Himalayer* is only the softened sound of Chimæra, and that the roots of the first part of both words may be traced through *Nequâv*, *Hims*, and *Hiver*, and those of the latter part through *alpe*, *âsp*, *ara*, and, with Cicero's leave, *ala*. So that the meaning will be *cold heights*, or *snowy mountains*.

Amazons were of the same race as the Cimbri and Teutones, whose women did fight in battle, and who killed their husbands if they fled. The female Eluths, or Calmucks, are still remarkable for their horsemanship; and if we join Hipp and Eluth, we shall perceive that Hippolyte the Amazon is not the idle coinage of a poet's phantasy, but that the story arose from the bravery and horsemanship of the female Eluths.

So far then the Bellerophon of fable is not an "airy nothing." If we place the Amazons near the Anisenus Sinus of the Euxine Sea, and allow the goat of the Chimæra to be the emblem of Egypt, we shall easily find "a local habitation and a name" for Bellerophon's conquests; and their date may be fixed by Homer's authority, who tells us that Sarpedon and Glaucus, two heroes of the Trojan war, were the grandsons of Bellerophon.

If then we believe the Trojan war on the authority of Homer, why is Bellerophon to be denied a place in history; and why are we content to believe in the high antiquity of the Grecian heroes, when we know that from the time of Eratosthenes to the present day, from the earliest attempt to the latest, neither labor nor ingenuity can give consistency to Grecian chronology?

But leaving Bellerophon for the present, let us return to a conqueror whose antiquity should be no bar to his notoriety. Nebuchadnezzar flourished about 600 years before the birth of our Saviour, and consequently very long after Cadmus had introduced letters into Greece, and long after Lycurgus had established his extraordinary system, and given the Spartans a taste for the songs of Homer, but only a short time before Pisistratus collected those songs, and became the patron of literature.

Now if this is the case, why have profane historians taken so little notice of Nebuchadnezzar? He was the golden head of the four great monarchies: he is styled "a king of kings" not by flatterers, but by prophets, one of whom declared that his dominion reached to the end of the earth; that wheresoever the children of men dwelt, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven were given into his hand, and that he was made ruler over them all: so that they who believe in revelation, should allow that Nebuchadnezzar was king over all the civilised world.

If we seek for a notice of this mighty conqueror in classical history, we are told that he is the same as the Labynetus of Herodotus; that is to say, the same as he who is commemorated for having assisted to make peace between Cyaxares and Alyattes. The Athenians and the other European Greeks are said to have sent out colonies to Ionia, Æolis, Doris, Byzantium, Italy, Sicily, Cyrene, &c.: but if we ask what they were

doing while Tyre and Sidon, Moab and Ammon, Egypt and Elam, were overthrown, we shall be told that the Pythian games were first established at Delphi, and the first comedy was acted at Athens by Susarion and Dolon. A commerce which extended throughout the habitable world was ruined; Egypt was laid waste for forty years; the Phœnicians were roaming about in search of a settlement; the outcasts of Elam had begun to penetrate into every country; the name of Ammon had perished, and the children of Ammon had begun their vagabond life: but during this great convulsion and change, the forefathers of those who were so very inquisitive after news, either knew nothing of what was going on, or gave themselves no concern at all about it. When will these absurdities open our eyes to the truth? When shall we allow that what is written in Hebrew, is as good as what is written in Greek or Latin; and that to verify profane history, we must make it agree with the Bible?

* Perhaps the reader may now be prepared for assertions which would have shocked him if they had been made sooner; namely, that the Bellerophon of fable is the Nebuchadnezzar of Scripture; and that the travels of the gods; the emigration of Inachus, Phoroneus, Ægialeus, Cecrops, Cadmus, Danaus, Ion, Dorus, Xuthus, Camber, Brutus, &c. &c.; the wanderings of Hercules and Æneas, of the Pelasgi, and of the Tyrheni, must all be dated from the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar; and that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are two of the harlot songs of Tyre, of Phœnician Tyre, the real and only Phœnix.

But we will proceed gradually and slowly; and first of all, let us finish with Bellerophon and Nebuchadnezzar. The dream which contained the order for Nebuchadnezzar's destruction was related by Nebuchadnezzar himself to Dāniel, and Nebuchadnezzar knew nothing of its meaning. We may remark also, that the hand-writing on the wall was not understood by Belshazzar, and that he was very anxious to have it interpreted. The dream of Nebuchadnezzar was verified at the end of twelve months, and Belshazzar and his empire were destroyed within a few hours after Daniel's interpretation of the hand-writing. Predictions so remarkable, and fulfilled in so remarkable a manner, and relating to the greatest empire in the world, would not be readily forgotten, and might easily pass into a proverb; but the letters of the fabulous Bellerophon seem to have had no bad consequences; on the contrary, the gods befriended him both in his long journey and in the adventures which Iobates imposed on him, and his success was such as to lead to a royal alliance and sovereignty. His subsequent misery is not said to have

arisen from the letters, but from the hatred of all the gods according to Homer's account, and from his own presumption according to other legends. Shall we believe that the proverb originated from the successful adventures of the fabulous Bellerophon; of a hero for whom no place has been found in history; or from the real and very remarkable and very public consequences which followed the interpretation of that dream which Nebuchadnezzar related, but did not understand; or of that hand-writing which appeared when Belshazzar and a thousand of his lords were feasting, which none of the king's wise men could read, and by which Belshazzar was greatly troubled and his lords were astonished? If we prefer a fable to reality, let us not talk of the philosophy of history; or if we think that the proverb could not originate from the calamities of Nebuchadnezzar, because it applies as well or better to Belshazzar, let us not boast much of the march of intellect: for there is hardly a man among us who does not confuse history by combining events which, though similar, did not happen at the same time, and who by so doing does not allow that the perfect accuracy of an old tradition would be as suspicious as the minute agreement of two witnesses is thought in a court of law. Unless Bellerophon and his adventures have a place found for them in profane history, I shall take leave to infer from the very existence of the proverb, that its origin and explanation must be sought in the history of Nebuchadnezzar or of Belshazzar; and if the reader allows that it originated from either of them, he makes me a very important concession, for he so far at least allows that the songs of Homer have disguised and falsified the truth.

Let us now proceed from the letters to the conquests. That Nebuchadnezzar did make those conquests which Bellerophon is said to have made,—that is, that Nebuchadnezzar did conquer Elam, Judah, Syria, Ethiopia, and Egypt,—must be granted by those who think that the Scriptures are true. And here it may be as well to mention, that the truth of the Scriptures is the axiom, or datum, or postulatum, call it which you will, on which my reasoning rests. It is a point which I do not intend to discuss, because it has been discussed sufficiently, and because modern liberality is all on one side; so that unless the reader believes that all scripture was given by inspiration, he and I are and must continue to be at variance.

Homer has told us that Bellerophon was hated by all the gods; but he has given no reason for their hatred. "When you can't talk sense, talk metaphor," said Curran; and accordingly we have found a metaphorical meaning in expressions, of which

we could not make plain sense. The hatred of all the gods, means that Bellerophon was very unfortunate. Why and wherefore he was so unfortunate, we may find out at our leisure; but if we take the words in their literal sense, we may explain them by that decree in which Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the power of the only true God, and which was very likely to offend all the idolaters.

Let us now consider why in this and other¹ instances later authors added to Homer's story. Had Homer spoken the plain truth, the veneration in which that very great poet, though very false historian, was held, would have prevented their additions and perversions from obtaining currency: I conclude, therefore, that Pegasus, and the flying up to heaven, and the being cast down, and the wandering in solitude and misery, form parts of the same fable, and that they are all to be explained by the history of Nebuchadnezzar. For the light and fiery Pegasus, I take the liberty of substituting the river-horse or hippopotamus of the Nile, until another substantial substitute is provided.¹ The plunder of Egypt was decreed to Nebuchadnezzar, in recompense of his toil in besieging Tyre. In his great service against that city, every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled; yet he had no wages, and therefore he was to take the multitude and the spoil and the prey of Egypt, and it was to be the wages for his army. Riches generally produce presumption; so we may reasonably suppose that the conquest of Egypt, or of Pegasus, was one cause of that proud speech, for which his kingdom was taken from him, and he was driven from men; and so far the Bellerophon of fable and the Nebuchadnezzar will be found to be one and the same hero. They who chose to omit Nebuchadnezzar could not give Bellerophon a place in history, lest the confession of one imposture should lead to the discovery of others: for a lie, whether poetical or not, is often upheld by the framer, not so much for its own sake, as for the sake of others, which must stand and fall with it.

No two names can be less alike in sound than Bellerophon and Nebuchadnezzar. No two countries seem to have so little in common as those of the Greek and the Chaldean. I am bound, however, to attempt to discover a likeness in some particulars; for the names evidently mean something, and we are not to suppose that Lycia was taken at hap-hazard as a theatre for Bellerophon's exploits.

¹ The line with which Euripides begins his *Helena*,

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενον ῥοαί,

should have led us to discover the true origin of the Muses.

We will first analyse the name of the great Chaldean. It is spelt in many different ways; but in all of them, and in the name of his father also, we may perceive an allusion to Nebo; and Nebo may stand for the Babylonians, who worshipped Nebo. The father of Nebuchadnezzar took Nineveh; and Pul, though not the builder of Nineveh, is said to have been the founder of its great power. Ahmed Pacha, the defender of Acre, was called Djezzar from his murderous habits; and we may therefore be permitted to assert, that in Tiglath-pileser and Nabopolassar, &c. *-eser* and *-assar* signify destroyer: so that Nabo-pol-assar, the name of the father of Nebuchadnezzar, was, like Genghis Khan, and Pharaoh and Abimelech, a title rather than a proper name. Ad or Adad, or Hadad or Ader, will be found to allude to Syria; and the reader may have observed that the rough aspirate in many words is first softened and then omitted, though the omission of it may be thought vulgar. The *wh* in whole was probably so sounded as to distinguish *whole* from *hole*. *Whole*, however, is now pronounced like *hole*; and in what we call cockney pronunciation, though it is by no means confined to the natives of London, *hole* becomes *ole*. So in Hebrew ה is by some pronounced Heth or Cheth, by some Heh; and those who adopt the vowel-points, tell us very gravely that ה or He has no sound at all.¹ If then the elegance which forbids loud or harsh utterance does play these changes with the aspirates, let us suppose that Nebuchadnezzar alludes both to Nebo or Babylon, and to Hadad or Syria; by adding Esar, the etymologist will find a clue to the sense of Nebuchadnezzar; and if he has either love or patience for tracing the genealogy of syllables and letters, and their adventures in different languages, he will probably not lose his labor. And so much for Nebuchadnezzar.

If we take the Greek name as we find it in Homer, it is Bellerophon^{tes}: *phontes* is allowed to signify a slaughterer; and we are told that Bellerophon^{tes} got his name from killing his uncle Bellerus. Unluckily, Homer knows nothing of this Bellerus, and no one else can make any thing of him. Bellerus is in fact one of those convenient suppositions by which the river is so often turned to meet the bridge. "Bel boweth down: Nebo

¹ Cham, Ham, Ammon; Guillaume, William; *γαῖα*, *ala*; *χαμαί*, *humus*; and the change of the Latin Cicero or Kikero into our Cicero or Sisero, may serve to show how much we consult ease in our pronunciation. As for *He*, it is allowed sometimes to be an aspirate; Eusebins; however, *He* with *epsilon*, (see Prep. Evan.) *Aleph* is allowed to have the power of *h* in *hour*; which is equivalent to the power of an Irish degree in the English Inns of Court.

stoopeth." Do not Bel and Nebo correspond? and in Aram and Arabia, and Ar and Er, may we not find a correspondent for Kad or Chad? If so, Bellerophon and Nebuchadnezzar, notwithstanding the difference of their sound, are similar in sense.

It remains to close this long and tedious investigation by a comparison of the different countries. Two lines of the catalogue, and these two the last of the catalogue, comprise the description of Sarpedon and of Glaucus, and of that Lycia which had been ruled over by Bellerophon: so that we have little else in the catalogue than the names of Lycia and Sarpedon to guide us. Luckily both these names can be made to bear an allusion to fire, and we know that the Chaldeans were worshippers of fire. Sirius and the Sirocco, Zoroaster or Zerdusht, Servius the Roman king, the Surtur of Northern mythology, and other names, may serve to show that the first syllable of Sarpedon may allude to fire; and the titles of Apollo, the heathen god of *light*, are so frequently connected with Lycia, as to justify our supposing, that Lycia was so called from its fiery mountain. But what has Lycia to do with Zabianism, and the Chaldean worshippers of fire? A curious little circumstance may serve to show that they are not unconnected. We may learn from Bochart and Michaelis and Schneider, that the Zabatus of Xenophon and the modern Zab, and the Lycus of other Greeks and the Diaba or Diava of Ammianus, are the same river. Now Zab is Hebrew for a wolf, and Lycus or rather *Λύκος* is Greek for a wolf; so that they who called the heathen god of light Lycius, and worshipped him under that title, differed from the Zabians in name rather than sense: Zab, Diava, and day; Lycius, *λυκάβας*, Loxias, lux, lukewarm, lew, light; and *low* in Scotch, and *loge* and *loga*, all seem to be of the same family.¹

But the Chaldeans of Scripture were very gay in their dress; very uncouth or unintelligible in their speech; and after the fall of Babylon they were held in little repute by other nations. These are remarkable facts; what have they to do with the Lycians? If Glaucus wore golden armour, he was as gay as

¹ For *loge* and *loga*, see *Low* in Jamieson's Dictionary. As I hope to prove that the tradition of Camber and Brutus is founded in fact, I may be permitted to hint that the *Ll* of our Cymry was not unknown in Asia. We have softened the sound of *Ll* in *Lloyd*, but we may recognise it in *Floyd*; and in the same manner, perhaps, Phlegyas, who, by the bye, is placed under a logan-stone, and the Ligyes, and the Leleges, all seem to relate to the worshippers of light. But what will the reader think, when I shall attempt to prove that Phlegyas and his daughter are Levi and Dinah? Yet Levin is our old word for lightning. If the reader will not allow the *Sar* in Sarpedon to allude to fire, he will, perhaps, allow a relationship between *Glaucus* and *glow*.

needs be, and a little gayer too ; but we must also bear in mind that although the Leleges are not mentioned in the second book of the Iliad, they are mentioned in three other books, and moreover that the Carians were close neighbors and apparently on very good terms with them. Nastes, a chief of the Carians,¹ seems to have been gayer than Glaucus, for he is mentioned as wearing gold like a girl ; and although there was a variety of languages among the forces of Priam, and we are told that by ' barbarians ' we may understand all who were not Greeks, it is very clear that the Carians are the only people whom Homer calls barbarous in their speech.

Here then are some circumstances which may deserve notice. The Leleges are not mentioned in the catalogue ; though a speech of Æneas shows that they had been actively engaged in the war. Nastes the Carian wore gold like a girl, and the Carians alone are characterised as being of barbarous speech. We are told by Herodotus that the Carians invented crests for the helmets, and devices or ornaments for the shields ; and we may learn that the Carian of the Greeks and the Cardax of the Persians, though fond of fighting, were not much honored by those who used their services. Car, Kars, the Carchi, Cardax, Carduchus, Koordistan, and Chaldea,² will be easily connected by those who have compared modern and ancient geography ; and they will find that the Ligyes of Herodotus came from the same quarter : so that a connexion, though too obscure perhaps for the general reader, and not accurately traced in this place, will be found to exist between the Bellerophon of fable and the Nebuchadnezzar of Scripture, in etymology, geography, and history ;³

¹ Nastes or Amphimachus : it matters not which.

² Homer makes Bellerophon come from Ephyre, and the old name of Halicarnassus was Zephyre ; but I do not pretend that the Caria of Asia Minor is the ancient Chaldea. The Chaldeans were marauders as early as the time of Job ; and it is remarkable that the Septuagint, both in Genesis and Nehemiah, translates the Hebrew " Aur of the Chasdim," or, as we call it, " Ur of the Chaldees," by the *country* or *land* (χώρα) of the Chaldæi. From this and from the marauding habits of the Chaldeans, I would conclude that their settlements, like those of the Tartars, were moveables rather than fixtures.

Aur signifies light or fire ; and the etymologist may easily derive the French *jour*, and perhaps the Turkish term *Giaour*, from it.

Καρβάσαι signifies to speak barbarously ; and as the Chaldeans became remarkable for the fineness of their clothing, perhaps Carbasia is derived from them.

³ *Kars*, lately taken by the Russian General, is not far from the Chalybes or Chaldæi of D'Anville ; but the similarity between the vagabond, fortune-telling and irreclaimable Gipsies, Carians and Chaldeans seems strongest in these four points : 1st. The Carians are characterised as *βαρβαρόφωνοι* by Homer. Isaiah (xxxiii. 19.) charac-

and they who think the inference too extraordinary to be true, who cannot believe that fable is a perversion of scriptural truth, ought to be as scrupulous in other matters, and not swallow a camel by believing that so great a conqueror as Nebuchadnezzar, and so great a dispersion as he effected, interested the Greeks so little, that they went on very merrily with their shows, and as it seems took no notice at all of what was going on abroad!

Let me remind the reader that my main argument is this: "We must find a place in profane history for Nebuchadnezzar,¹ and the dispersions of Elam, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Egypt, if we maintain that profane history is true,—unless we deny the truth of the Scriptures."

Resting here for the present, we will take a yet bolder flight in the next article, and endeavor to show that the Pelasgi of profane history and the Ammonites of Scripture are still to be found in the Gipsies; the original Druids and Dervishes and Dryads, and Fauni, and Fays and Fairies, and Fakirs and Brownies.

CAMBRIDGE PRIZE POEMS, FOR 1828.

HANNIBAL.

OLIM supinum in vallibus Appulis,
Claro ruinis Hesperii¹ jugo,
Lauri coronabant palumbes
Idaliæ patriaque myrto
Vatem Sabinum:² Me Genius loci
Mira jacentem lusit imagine,
Glauca salictorum sub umbra
Cum placidos peterem sopores:

terises the Chaldeans in the same manner. 2dly. The Carian women were noted for staining ivory; the Carians first used crests; and what was called an Ionian dress, was properly a Carian dress: see Herodotus, l. 5. c. 80. Will not this suit the Chaldeans? 3rdly. The Chaldeans were much addicted to astrology. We may learn from Pliny, Clemens, and Eusebius, that the Carians were no strangers to augury and astrology. 4thly. The Carians were mercenaries; they fought valiantly, and were little esteemed. Was not this the fate of the Chaldeans?

¹ Bryant has shown that Shishak or Sesac is not Sesostris. It would not be difficult to show that Sesostris is Nebuchadnezzar.

² Hor. Od. III. iv. 9. "Me fabulosæ Vulture in Appulo," &c. Vultur M. situs ad Aufidium, prope abest a Cannis.

Me fluctuantis sopiit Aufidi
 Auditus ægro rivus anhelitu
 Mæstoque riparum susurro,
 Flebilis geminare murmur,
 Singultientes inter arundines :—
 Mox et migrantes Hannibalis manus
 Sonare, turritæque¹ turmæ
 Et peditum glomerare nimbi
 Vîsi repente ; et signa micantibus
 Volare campis ; en ! Nomadum tremunt
 Cristæ, phætræque Mauri, et
 Purpurei rutilant Iberi !
 Invictæ Mavors ! Romulidum sator !
 Fugere, fugere Ausoniæ manus !
 Undæque Cannenses Latina
 Cæde tepent, superante Pæno.
 Pænus per Alpes, per rigidum gelu,
 Per stricta vinclis saxa adamantinis
 Perrupit, insultansque clivis
 Institit Italiæ cubantis :
 Qualis latentem pumicibus cavis
 Nidum et columbam despicit insciam,
 Immixtus alarum sonanti
 Remigio, Jovis acer ales.—
 Illi trisulcorum ætria fulgurum,
 Brumæque sedes, castraque nubibus
 Vallata, ferratumque limen
 Objicibus patuit solutis :
 Ex quo parentem suspiciens puer,
 Parvasque dixit projiciens manus,—
 “ O, cui² sepulcralem cupressum
 Et piceas ferimus corollas,—
 Si Tu vireto myrtifero latens
 Sanctasque valles et silvas colis,
 Si te reluctantem fatigat
 Spretus amor, veteresque curæ,—

¹ Elephantum, sc.

² Hoc se obstrinxit juramento, ad aram in fano Didonis. Sil. Ital.
i. 81.

Phœnissa Dido !—Te precibus piis
Divam¹ vocamus progenies Tua :
En ! fraudis infidæque dextræ
Dardanidum Tibi partus² Ultor ! —

Ultore me, non expedient choros
Festis diebus Romuleæ nurus,
Nec sponsa votivam recepto
Texuerit philyram marito.

Gætula, fas est, nutriet Appulas
Leæna capras : Me Priami domo
Natisque famosi latronis
Nulla dies sociabit unquam ;
Dum flectat axem in gramine Martio
Romana pubes ; dum Capitolio
Palma coronati quadrigis
Hesperios³ referant triumphos.”—

Fertur¹ loquentes æthere lurido
Audisse voces, et rutilum Jovem
Vidisse, convulsumque magna
Sidereum laquear ruina.

Duxitque tollens Ipse manu Deus
Vastas per Alpes, in Ligurum nigra
Vineta, prætextasque myrto
Eridani resonantis undas.

Magnum ille terrorem intulit accolis
Dulcis Timavi et matribus Umbriæ:
Illum triumphali quadriga et
Fulmineo rapidum tumultu

Sensit reductæ ripa Placentiæ ;
Sensere valles, grataque Fæsulæ
Dumeta Sylvano, chorisque
Capripedum, tacitæque laurus :

¹ Justin. xviii. 6.

² Dido imprecatur jam moritura, Virg. *Æn.* iv. 625. “ Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus *Ultor* !” ubi Hannibalem putatur cogitasse.

³ Liv. xxi. 22. “ Fama est visum ab eo juvenem divina specie, atque post insequi cum fragore cæli nimbum : proinde sequi jussus,” &c. cf. ad Sil. iii. 181.

Illum—, Velini sulphureus liquor,
 Canens genistis, et Trebiæ palus,
 Alnique nutantesque¹ taxi et
 Puniceo Trasymenus æstu.

Quin et minaces horruit impetus
 Romana virtus, ne Balearibus
 Lucos² Aventinos et ipsum
 Frangeret arietibus Quirinum.

Atqui furentis detinuit gradum
 Non auspicatis seditionibus
 Devota Carthago, ruensque
 In furias sibi luctuosas.

Flevitque³ lentis passibus Hannibal
 Suæ recedens arce Calabriæ, et
 Pinus⁴ Tarentinas, et albi
 Pascua respiciens Galesi.

Flevit, recedens non aliter, Getas
 Quam si remotos et Scythiæ nivem
 Mutaret apricis suorum
 Litoribus Libycoque cœlo.

Dixitque tandem victus: "Avi mala
 Domum redibo. Castra Ego Punicis
 Romana sub portis, et hostem
 Aspiciam vacuas per ædes

Superbientem: proh! patriæ domus
 Deserta! Te non Scipiadæ furor,
 Non ira Marcelli ruentis
 Edomuit, Fabiæve fraudes;

Te perfidorum dextera civium et
 Turpes triumphî; Te Superum manus;—
 Excessit, evulsis fragore
 Porticibus, furibunda Juno,

Excessit aris!—Quicquid erit, tamen
 Romæ superbas non Ego per vias
 Deducar, exosus Quirinum
 Hannibal, Ausoniosque Divos.

¹ Terræ sc. motu, dum ibi pugnaretur, Liv. xxiv. 31.

² Liv. xxvi. 10.

³ Liv. xxx. 20.

⁴ Propert. ii. 34.

Non hoc videbo dedecus—Ibimus,
Lætas beatorum ibimus insulas,
Qua, functus ingrato labore,
Elysio requiescit antro

Parens Hamilcar ; qua comitem vocat
Me nunc parenti redditus Hasdrubal,
Et jam profecturum sub umbras
Conqueritur nimium morari."

CHR. WORDSWORTH,
COLL. SS. TRIN. SCHOL.

EPIGRAMMATA.

ὃν δὲ πείρα διαφαίνεται
ὧν τις ἐξοχώτερος γένηται.—PINDAR.

" Πάλλας Ἀθηναίη, τί γελαῖς, ἄτοπον γελαίοισα ;"
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη τείνων τόξα ποτανὸς Ἑρως.
" οὐ σε καλὸν βέλεσιν καγχάζεμεν ἀμετέροισιν,
ἀμετέρων βελέων μήποτε γευσαμένην—
ἀλλ' ἄγε, δὸς μέσον ἦπαρ ἑμοῖς ἐγχεῖσαι δίστοῖς·
εἶτα γέλα·—μή μοι δοῦσα δέ, μὴ γελάσῃς·
ὥς γὰρ ἑμοί,—τὸ κράτος, τὸ μάχης ἄτερ, οὐ κράτος ἐστίν· —
ἢ δ' ἀρετὴ πείρας ἄμμορος, οὐκ ἀρετή."

πόλλ' ἥπιστατο ἔργα, κακῶς δ' ἥπιστατο πάντα.—HOM.

PIGMENTA quidam,—coccinum, violaceum,
Nigrum, crocotum, vitreum, subalbidum,
Et quicquid est colorum ubique gentium,
Una coactum temperabat assula.—
Quid multa ?—magno fecerat molimine
Furvam¹ paludem lividissimi luti.

Sic, mi Juventi, quum velis nescire nil,
Et in cerebri quatuor unciiis tui
Omnes ubique temperes scientias,—
Næ tu colorem non facis hercle,—sed lutum.

CHR. WORDSWORTH,
COLL. SS. TRIN. SCHOL.

¹ Notum est, cæterorum colorum mistura furvum effici.

PORSONIAN PRIZE.**SHAKSPEARE.****TROILUS AND CRESSIDA. Act 3. Sc. 3.****ULYSSES. ACHILLES.**

UL. TIME hath, my Lord, a wallet at his back,
 Wherein he puts alms for oblivion,
 A great-sized monster of ingratitude:
 Those scraps are good deeds past; which are devoured
 As fast as they are made, forgot as soon
 As done: Perseverance, dear my Lord,
 Keeps honor bright: To have done, is to hang
 Quite out of fashion, like a rusty mail
 In monumental mockery. Take the instant way;
 For honor travels in a strait so narrow,
 Where one but goes abreast; keep then the path;
 For Emulation hath a thousand sons,
 That one by one pursue: If you give way,
 Or hedge aside from the direct forthright,
 Like to an enter'd tide they all rush by,
 And lead you hindmost;—
 Or, like a gallant horse fallen in first rank,
 Lie there for pavement to the abject rear,
 O'errun and trampled on: Then what they do in present,
 Though less than yours in past, must o'ertop yours:
 For Time, is like a fashionable host,
 That slightly shakes his parting guest by the hand;
 And with his arms outstretch'd as he would fly,
 Grasps in the corner: Welcome ever smiles,
 And farewell goes out sighing. O, let not virtue seek
 Remuneration for the thing it was;
 For beauty, wit,
 High birth, vigor of bone, desert in service,
 Love, friendship, charity, are subjects all
 To envious and calumniating Time.
 One touch of nature makes the whole world kin,—
 That all, with one consent, praise new-born gawds,
 Though they are made and moulded of things past;
 And give to dust, that is a little gilt,
 More laud than gilt o'er-dusted.
 The present eye praises the present object:
 Then marvel not, thou great and complete man,

That all the Greeks begin to worship Ajax ;
 Since things in motion sooner catch the eye,
 Than what not stirs. The cry went once on thee,
 And still it might ; and yet it may again,
 If thou wouldst not entomb thyself alive,
 And case thy reputation in thy tent ;
 Whose glorious deeds, but in these fields of late,
 Made emulous missions 'mongst the gods themselves,
 And drove great Mars to faction.

CHR. WORDSWORTH,

COLL. SS. TRIN. SCHOL.

IDEM GRÆCE REDDITUM.

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ. ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ.

Ο.Δ. Ὀναξ, φέρει πῆραν τιν' ὤμοισιν χρόνος,
 ὅπου κομίζει πτωχικὰς Διὶ τροφάς,
 τῇ δυσχαρίστοις χάρισιν ἐξωγκωμένη.
 τὰδ' ἐκ παλαιῶν κλάσματ' εὖ δεδρωμένων
 ὁμοῦ πεπραγμέν' ἐστὶ καὶ βεβρωμένα,
 πέφυκεν ἄρτι, καὶ λέλθ' αὐθήμερον.
 τὸ γοῦν ἔχεσθαι τῶν πεπραγμένων ἀπριξ,
 σώζει τὸ καλλιφεγγὲς εὐκλείας φάος.
 ὁ δ' αὖτ' ἀπειπὼν, οἶάπερ πανοπλία
 μελαμπαγῆς τις, ἐκποδὼν ἐκρήμνατο
 ἀρχαιοσέμνῳ γαυριῶν ἀγάλματι.
 ἴθ' ἀρπάσαι, τὸν ἔνθεν ἀρπάσαι στίβον,
 εὐδοξία γὰρ ἐν στενοῖς ὁδοιπορεῖ,
 ἴν' οὐ τρέχει τις, μὴ οὐ μονοστιβῆς δραμῶν.
 κράτει, κράτει συ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ζῆλος γὰρ οὖν
 τέκνων φυτεύει μυρῶν βλαστήματα,
 τούτων δ' ἐφεξῆς πᾶς σέ τις κυνηγετεῖ.
 σοῦ δ' ἐκκλιθέντος ἢ πεσόντος ἐκδρόμου,
 πεισπεσόντι προσφερεῖς κλυδωνίῳ
 ὑπερβέουσι, λολισθιον λελοιπότες.
 καὶ μὴν προκείσει γ' ἐκτάδην, χαμαιπετεὺς
 λάκτισμα τοῖσιν ἐσχάτην τεταγμένοις,
 ὡς εὐγενὴς τις ἵππος ἐν πρόμοις πεσὼν,
 πατούμενός τε καὶ κατεσποδημένος.
 τοίγαρ τὰ τούτων ἀρτίως εἰργασμένα
 νικᾷν τὰ σοῦ παλαιά, καὶ μείζω κύρη,
 πᾶν' ἐστ' ἀνάγκη προξένου γὰρ εὐτρόπου.

ὄργαις ἔοικεν αἰολοστρόφοις χρόνος,
 ὅστις δι' ὑγρᾶς τοὺς μὲν ἐξοξηωμένους
 μεθῆκε χειρὸς, τὸν δὲ δὴ νηήλυδα
 πτηνοῖς ἐμαρψεν ἀγκαλῶν πετάσμασιν·
 παῖδρός γε τοίνυν φροῖμιάζεται γέλως,
 τῷ δ' ἐξιόντι θρήνός ἐσθ' ὁμόστολος.
 μὴ δῆτα πρὸς θεῶν ἀρετὴ θηρευσάτω
 τοῦ πρὶν γενέσθαι μίσθον· εὐγένεια γὰρ
 ἀλκῇ, φρόνησιν, καλλονῇ, προθυμίᾳ,
 φιλότῃ, ἔρωϊ, εὐνοίᾳ,—πάνθ' ἀπλῶ λόγῳ,
 χρόνου φθονοῦντος καὶ φιλοψόγου κλύει.
 ἐμφυλλῶ γὰρ ξυγγενὲς κηδεύματι
 φύσις ξυνάπτει πάντα, ὥς ὁμορρόθοις
 φήμαις ἐπαινεῖν νεόγον' ἀγλαΐσματα
 καίπερ παλαιοῖς σχήμασιν πεπλασμένα,
 βαιῶ δὲ χρυσῷ τὴν χυοάζουσιν κόριν
 χρυσοῦ προτιμᾶν τοῦ κόνει κεχρωσμένου·
 ξυνὼν θ' ἕκαστος τὸ ξυνὸν σέβειν ἔφυ.
 πρὸς ταῦτα, μὴ, φέριστε, θαυμάσης ἔτι,
 ὀθούνεχ' αἱ νῦν Ἑλλάδος πανηγύρεις
 Αἶαντα προσκυνοῦσι· τῶν γὰρ ἀστάτων
 φορᾷ πέφυκεν εὐμαρῶς ἀλώσιμον
 βρότειον ὄμμα, τοῖς δ' ἀκινήτοισιν οὐ.
 βᾶξεις μὲν ἢ πῖδημος ἢν πάλαι σέθεν,
 καὶ νῦν ἂν εἴη, καὶ πάλιν γενήσεται,
 εἰ μὴ συ κρύψεις· σαυτὸν ἐμψύχω τάφῳ,
 σκηναῖς τε τὴν σὴν κληῖδόν' ἐσφραγισμένην
 φράξεις, ὃ πολλὰ τῇδ' ἀριστεύσας δορὶ,
 στόλους ὃ πράξας ἐν θεοῖς ἐπιφθόνους,
 ὃ πρὸς χειρῶν ἀμιλλαν ὀρμήσας Ἄρην.

CHR. WORDSWORTH,

COLL. SS. TRIN. SCHOL.

ENGLISH PRIZE POEM.

THE INVASION OF RUSSIA BY NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.

γελᾷ δὲ δαίμων ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θερμῷ,
 τὸν οὐ παρ' αὐχούντ' ἰδὼν ἀμυχάνοις
 δῖους λέπαδνον, οὐδ' ὑπερθέοντ' ἄκραν.—ÆSCHYL. *Eum.* 530.

RIDE, boldly ride ! for thee the vernal gale
 Breathes life and fragrance o'er the teeming vale ;
 For thee the Seine, for thee the glassy bay
 Laughs in a revelry of golden day ;

And o'er the wave the mantling vineyards throw
 Their purple fruits, that in the mirror glow :
 Heaven lives and beams for thee : then boldly ride,
 Pageant of Gaul, and fair Italia's pride !
 Proudly thy eagle soars, thy banners stream
 In crimson folds, that mock the Sun's pale beam.
 Proudly thy coursers neigh, and pant to tread
 Muscovia's dust, and spurn the slumbering dead.
 "I hear ' a voice—it cried—To arms ! advance !—
 "I see the star of Austerlitz and France."

"Speed !"—They have sped—murmuring o'er hill and plain,
 Like the far murmur of the sleepless main—
 Wave after wave, a flood of silver light :
 Oh ! that so fair a day shall soon be plunged in night !

Awake ! ye Spirits—if on Niemen's shore
 Ye sleep, or listen to the midnight roar
 Of tumbling cataracts,—if ye love to play
 On the white foam, and course the dashing spray—
 I call ye now—on yon grey steep arise,
 And wake the slumbering legions of the skies ;
 Shout to the tardy winds and stagnant air,
 And rouse the vengeful thunder from his lair !
 Proclaim to him, who vaunts that none shall stay
 His arm, outstretch'd, omnipotent to slay :
 Proclaim—, that pale Disease, the withering form
 Of Desolation, and the sweeping storm,
 They quail not, shrink not, from the haughty foe—
 They have encamp'd, and they will overthrow !—
 Slowly and darkly o'er the pine-tree groves
 The brooding mass of devastation moves ;²
 It moves, it comes ! from skies convulsed and riven
 The tempest leaps, the artillery of heaven
 Peals from the clouds, the arrowy lightning's gleam
 Glares on the snows, and gilds the livid stream :
 The thunder growls around, and wildly sings
 Of banquets soon to be, with sullen mutterings.

Dost thou, proud Chief, the voice of anguish hear,
 And drop, when others weep, thy pitying tear ?
 Ah ! no—thou must not weep ! but calmly see
 Eyes glazed in death, grow dim, and die on thee ;

¹ Segur i. p. 68. "Do you see that *star* above us?" p. 73. "Who calls me?" p. 109. "Are we not the soldiers of Austerlitz?" these are the words of Napoleon. Of his belief in his fortunate star, see Porter's Campaign, p. 352.

² Segur i. 119. The Emperor had scarcely passed over the river (Niemen) when a rumbling sound began to agitate the air. This was conceived to be a fatal presage.

And smile where others smile not ; sights forlorn
 Must be but dreams ; and bursting hearts thy scorn !
 Ah ! canst thou hear that faint and stifled cry,
 And mock a dying father's agony ?
 Ten thousand fathers there in silence sleep,
 Around their bier no wife, no children weep ;
 The Vulture screams, the Eagle hovers nigh,
 Flaps its dark wing, and wheels around the sky.
 By moaning gusts their requiems are sung,
 Theirs is the storm's wild howl, the thunder's tongue ;
 Their shroud, yon leaden sea of floating gloom,
 Yon white and-heaving mounds their only tomb !
 Ten thousand widows there beside thee tread,
 Ten thousand orphans wail around thy bed :—
 Canst thou thus slay, and sleep ?—Ther' hie thee on !
 By orphans' tears thy festivals are won—
 Burn, vanquish, spoil !—but ah ! thy star¹ is dim !
 For One—the mighty God—thou canst not vanquish Him !

HE saw the scarlet banner wildly spread
 O'er yon black waste, the city of the dead ;
 He saw the victor ride in gorgeous state,
 Through fair Smolensko, houseless, desolate ;
 And smile amid the dust and matted gore,²
 The formless wreck of what was man no more.
 He hears the triumph's peal, that frantic cry,
 By winds, his heralds, wafted to the sky—
 Great God of vengeance ! Not to Thee they raise
 The anthem's voice, the chaunted hymn of praise :
 Havoc to them is dearer than thy heaven ;
 Their hallelujahs are to Carnage given !

The spires³ of Moscow glittering from afar
 In the pale lustre of yon silver star,
 Her steel-clad bastions, and embattled walls,
 Her domes, her faues, and gold-bespangled halls,
 No more the minstrel's midnight music hear,
 No vocal strains her silent gardens cheer :—
 Save where yon holy quire,⁴ in pure array,
 Through the gray portal treads its lonely way :

¹ See the first Note.

² Segur, i. 227—233, speaks of "heaps of smoking ashes, where lay human skeletons dried and blackened by the fire."

³ Moscow was called the City of the Golden Spires—its houses were covered with polished iron.

⁴ Segur ii. 17. Their priests headed the procession: turning their eyes once more towards Moscow, they seemed to be bidding a last farewell to their holy city,

They with soft notes, that sigh upon the gale,
Wake the sad echoes of the sleeping vale;
Breathing, fair city, in a dirge to thee,
Their sweetest, calmest, holiest melody;
And cast, as o'er the mountain's brow they wind,
A mournful glance, a long last look behind.

'Tis past, for ever—see! aloft they fly,
Yon smouldering flakes upfloating to the sky;—
Till the moon fades beneath the lurid stream,
Blotted from heaven, or shoots a ghastly beam,—
As some fond mourner, with averted eyes,
Kindles the pile on which a parent lies;
Thy children, Moscow, rear thy funeral pyre,
Plant the red torch, and fan the pious fire.—
For wilt thou, wilt thou thy Destroyer greet,
Drest with the garlands of thy own defeat?
Or bid thy vaulted domes with loud acclaim
Attune their echoes to a Tyrant's name;
Or see by feet unblest thy temples trod,
And blood-red Eagles waved above the shrine of God?—
Thou wilt not! Therefore with glad eyes I see
The golden flame—the flame that sets thee free!
Thy fretted aisles, thy burnish'd columns bow;
Rejoice, rejoice! thou art triumphant now.
There, there! from street to street with dreary roar
Their yellow tide the rampant billows pour,
And whirl'd by winds that sweep tempestuous by,
Point their red spires, and sail along the sky.

Tyrant of Earth! what art thou? not to thee
Crouch the proud surges of yon lurid sea—
In vain on Kremlin's height with pallid stare
I see the scowl above the flames' red glare,
And bid them make thee partner of their joy,
And leave thee something,—something to destroy.
These smoking piles—is this thy conquering reign?
Those voiceless streets, that desolated plain?
Thy throne,—you scarr'd and solitary tower,
Rock'd by the winds, and channel'd by the shower?
Thy train,—shall they thy splendid deeds declare
With their wan lips, and bless thee for despair?
Go! hunt the clouds, and shout it to the gale,
And let the night winds learn the vaunted tale!
Go! bid the sky with acclamations ring,
And bellowing storms thy boasted conquest sing!

Tell of the feats thy own right hand has done, |
 Unblest of God,—thy own right hand alone !
 Proclaim,—that thou with unrelenting eye
 Couldst boldly see thy legions faint and die ;
 Couldst o'er yon waste thy grasping reign advance,
 And buy a desert with the blood of France !—
 No marble here thy blazon'd name shall bear,
 Nor storied wall thy streaming trophies wear,
 No deluged streets shall feast thy thirsting ken
 With one vast death, with hecatombs of men !
 Though Russia curse thee, Gaul shall curse thee more—
 That crimson flood, it was thy country's gore !
 Ah ! canst thou yon forsaken suppliants¹ see
 Extend their mute, their pallid hands to thee ?
 Creep to the gate, and in the portal stand
 Of yon dark house of woe, a ghastly band ?—
 For thee, they left soft Gallia's fragrant gales,
 Their own dear hill, their own domestic vales.
 For thee !—they trod for thee Muscovia's wild
 And withering wastes, where Summer never smil'd,
 And blackening woods, where sighs the waving pine,—
 And, that their eyes thus wildly glare, 'tis thine !————
 —Yet he did calmly pass without a sigh,
 And when for France they ask'd him, bade them die !

But thou,² whose breast with holier ardour fed,
 Glow'd for thy country, for thy country bled ;
 I hail thee, Patriot ! and with Moscow's flame
 Will write the glories of thy deathless name.
 Patriot ! whose dauntless soul could brook to see
 Moscow in ashes laid, or Moscow free ;—
 Enslaved,—it could not brook—for who would dwell
 A splendid captive in a painted cell ?
 Better in dungeons and in gloom to pine,
 Than feast in halls which were, and are not thine !
 What boots the branching roof, the pillar's mould,
 The foliaged shaft, the cornice dipp'd in gold ?
 If prostrate man a Tyrant's rod adore,
 And crouch a menial where he reign'd before.
 Then, who exults not ? though the fitful breeze
 Sigh o'er thy rifted pier, and crumbling frieze,

¹ Segur, ii. p. 131. "When they (the sick in the hospitals) saw the army repass, and that they were about to be left behind, the least infirm crawled to the threshold, and extended towards us their supplicating hands."

² Count Rostopchin—by whose advice Moscow was set on fire by the Russians.

Desolate Moscow !—for around thy grave
 Stern Virtue rears her freshest architrave,
 And Faith and patriot Love with lock'd embrace
 Entwine their arms, and guard the silent place.
 Pale Memory twines a cypress wreath for thee,
 Clasps thy cold urn, the ashes of the free,—
 And Granta bids her youthful bards relate
 How bright in life thou wert, in death how great !
 Though guardian Heav'n has made, with kindlier care,
 Her sons as free as thine, herself more fair ;
 She mourns thee ! though her new-born columns shine,
 To hail her PATRIOT PRINCE more blest than thine ;
 Though vernal flow'rs her happier Muses bring,
 And grace his fostering hand, who bade them sing !

Pale, palsied Winter !—thus, by tepid gales
 Arcadiau fann'd, and nursed in roseate vales,
 Or dreaming else in those Hesperian isles
 Bathed in pure light mid Spring's perennial smiles—
 Thus bards have named thee,—but that feeble name
 Thou, mighty Winter, proudly wilt disclaim :
 Though slumbering 'neath the cloud-pavilion'd throne
 Of Him who never sleeps, in chambers lone,—
 Where the strong Earthquakes, His archangels, are :
 Where the blue lightnings wave their torch-like hair—
 Thou, yet unseen, unheard, hast whiled away
 The Spring's soft hours, the Summer's tranquil day ;
 Thy sleep is slept !—no listless dreamer now,
 A Warrior arm'd, a dauntless Rider 'Thou !
 A mighty Hunter !—there I see the leap
 From torrent's shore to shore, from steep to steep :
 Are not thy footsteps o'er the pathless sea ?
 The streams, thy coursers, bend their necks to Thee !
 I see thee there with crystal bands enthral,
 The dash of waves, and curb the waterfall !

Ha ! hast thou found them ?—there thy victims lie
 Crouching and shrinking from the starless sky.
 Round ' the pale flame that flickers in the snow
 Their blighted cheeks with ghastly lustre glow :
 And some there are, who stand in silence by,
 Or breathe a prayer, and then lie down to die :
 Or cower in circles o'er their grave of snow,
 Shrouding their brows in dark unutterable woe :
 And some who laugh with parch'd and tearless glare,
 A joyless laugh, and revel in despair.

And one, whose heart is basking in the gleam
 Of a far land ; the sun-shine of a dream !
 Where the light trembles in the quivering shade
 Of some green orchard or dark olive glade ;
 Where clustering roses veil his own retreat,
 And ivy mantles o'er the door-way seat :
 And her fair form before his feverish sight
 Glides, like a voiceless phantom of the night ;
 That angel form he never more must see,
 Save in the visions of eternity.—
 Ah ! what will now those purple spoils avail,
 Stretch'd on the snows and scatter'd to the gale ?—
 No earthly form to-morrow's Sun shall find,
 Save the white waste, no whisper but the wind !

He comes ! he comes ! ye Gallic Virgins twine
 The myrtle wreath, and weave the eglantine—
 For him, who rides in gorgeous pomp along,
 Strew, strew the rose, and chaunt the choral song.
 For him, whose car has thunder'd o'er the plains,
 Fetter'd by frost in adamant chains.
 Ah ! no—he comes not thus ! no gladsome cry
 Shall shout his name, and hurl it to the sky ;
 No grateful crowds before his eagles bend,
 No laurell'd hosts his chariot-wheels attend :
 For him no mothers' lips shall softly pray,
 No hands be clasp'd to bless him on his way :
 His heralds Silence and the Night shall be,—
 A country's curse, his song of Victory !—

Therefore,—to Winter's God the Nations raise
 A holy concert of symphonious praise.—
 For THOU hast spoil'd the Spoiler : Thou hast bow'd
 The Scorners' strength, the threatenings of the Proud !
 Thee, their dread Champion ! Thee the Caspian shore,
 Dark Volga's flood, and Niemen's storms adore :
 Thee, the glad Tanais, Thee, the thundering voice
 Of Ister ; the Cantabrian depths rejoice ;
 Fair Tagus hears, and Alva's echoing caves
 Wake the soft music of his amber waves :
 And the great Earth, and everlasting Sea,
 To THEE their anthems pour, dread Lord of Hosts, To THEE

CHR. WORDSWORTH,

COLL. SS. TRIN. SCHOL.

GREEK PRIZE POEM.

ΑΙΓΤΗΠΤΟΣ.

"Αφθιταν γὰ Πυραμιδῶν, τὺ σεμνὸν
ὥς ὄναρ βέβακας, ἅπαξ βέβακας·
προπρὸ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔτι, καὶ φρανὸς μευ,
ἀγλαῖαν σᾶν

αὐθις ἀντέλλει τρομερά τις ἀκτὺς,
τέρπομαί τε δακρυοῦν μεριμνῶν
σὰς τύχας, Πρὸς βίστα, κροτῶ τε φόρμιγγ'
αἴλινον ὕμνων.

ὡς σε γὰρ λαλῶ, φθιμένων ἀνάκτων
φαίνεται σκιάσματα, καὶ πάρεστιν
ὁ χρόνος πᾶς μυριετής· Θεῶ δ' ἰν-
δάλλεται ἔργα.

ἦνί! λυγρὰν ἐκ νεφέων χάλαζαν
καὶ βαρὺν πέμπει σκότον, ἐγγελάξαις
ἀστραπῶντος ἐξ ὀρανῶ τυράννων
ἀφραδίαισιν.

ἦνί! τᾶς ἀμαιμακέτω θαλάσσης
ἔρραγεν τέραμνα, Θεῶ τε φύλοις
στρῶσε χεῖρ ἱππηλασίαν σάλων μεσ
σαγῦς ἑρεμνῶν

λάμπεται θ' ὑπώπια νύκτα πᾶσαν
ἥύτε στάλα φλογός! ἐν δὲ φῦζαν
δαίσις ἦσι, κακὰν τ' οἷζύν·
ἀλλ' ὁ διώκων

ἐμφόβοις σάλπιγξι καὶ ἱπποχάρμαις
ἀνδράσιν ταρασσεται· οὐασὶν μοι
ποντιᾶν πάφλασμα ῥοᾶν ὄρωρε
ὀλλυμένων τε

κύμασιν παλιρρόθοις ἰυγά·
ἀρμάτων ἐρείπια, καὶ χαλίνων,
κειμένους τ' ἄχνα κόρυθας, καὶ εὐρὺν
λοιγὸν ὄρημι!

ἄλλοτ' αὖ ταχύπτερον ἀμπὶ θυμὸν
Ἑλλάδος νεανίδος ἱλαδὸν μοι
ἴσταται φαντάσματα· καὶ γὰρ ᾗδε
Πιερίδων τις

χειραγώγησ' ἡμερόενθ' Ὀμηρον·
καὶ τεοῖς κατεῖδ' ἐρατοῖσι κάποις
ἀνθεμοῦντος Ἰηλυσίῳ ῥηθῶνας,
καὶ μέγ' ἐν ὄλβῳ.

ἀλλὰ μοι μὰν κῆρ φθινύθει, καὶ ὄμμα |
δακρύσιν βαρύνεται εἰσορῶντι
οἷά σ' ἔβλαψεν χρόνος, οἷα νεῖκος,
οἷα τυραννίδς,

μᾶτερ ἄμμων, ἰ' Ἀερίᾳ· τὸ γὰρ, τὸ
εὐλύρων οἴμωξ ἐφράδασσας ὕμνων
πρᾶτον, ἀγνᾶς τ' εὐνομίας, τὸ πρᾶτον
ἄστ' ἔδειμας

αἰθαλοῦντα μαρμαρόεντι φέγγει·
πνεῦσέ θ' ἀβρώς ὠκεανῖτις αὔρα
κίόνων δι' ἡλιβάτων—γέλαξε
χρυσέος αἰθέρ.

οὐ γὰρ ἦς οὕτως, ὅθ' ὁ λευκόπεπλος
παγκρατῆς Σέσωστρις ἀναξ ἀνάκτων
Μέμφιος σείσει θρόνον, ἔκ τε Θαβάν
στράψε παλαιάν.

ὦ πόποι! τί τερπνοτάταισιν αὐγαῖς
ἄλιος γέγαθεν ὅπα σιδαρᾶς
καρδίαν νύξ Δωλοσυνᾶς ἀτέρμων
ἱφι πιάζει;

οὔτις ἂν λεύσσοι τι μακάρτερόν τευ·
ὀλβία χθών, ἀννεφελᾶν ὑπ' αἰγλᾶν
εἰσαεὶ τέθηλας, ἄνομβρον ἀνθεῖ
ἄμβροτον εἶαρ·

αἰδὺ σῶν ἄρωμα ρόδων ἄησιν·
αἰδὺ βασσάων ἀνὰ μυρσινῶνας
ὄρνυται φθόγγος λιγυρῆς ὕδατων σῶν
ἀργυροφεγγῶν·

αἰδὺ τ' ἐν νάπαισιν ἐψα θρυλλεῖ
φθέγματ' ὀρώθων, δυσέρας τ' ἀηδῶν
τὰν σελαναίαν ὑπὸ νύκτα γᾶρυν
ἐξάνησι

χρυσέαν· ἥω λῶτος, ἐραννὸν ἄνθος,
ναμάτων ὑπερθε κάρα φαεννὸν
ἀνσχέθει σῶν κυανέων, κομάων
πουλὸ γέλασμα

ἀμπετῶν ἀκτῖσι μεσαμβριναῖσιν
ὠρανῶ· Νεῖλός τε δοτῆς ἑάων
πίονων γυᾶν ἐπινίσσεται· ρεῖ δ'
ἀμπεδον οἶνος,

¹ Αερίας ἀπὸ γᾶς

Εἷς τις ἐστὶ κηδεμών. *Aeschyl's Supplices.*

ῥεῖ τ' ἔλπιον, ῥεῖ γάλα· τρυγόνων τε
ποικιλοπτέρων ἔρσεις πανᾶμαρ
ἀσυχοῖς δαφνᾶν ὄαρος κλάδοισι
κωτίλα φωνεῖ.

φεῦ μάταν βλάσται ῥόδα, κᾶν βαθείαις
εὐστομεῖ γλυκὺς ξυλόχοισιν ὄρνις·
τίς τανῦν Ἐλευθερίας ἰδήσει
ἡρινὸν ἄνθος ;

τίς πάλιν γλώσσαν Σοφίας ἀκούσει ;
κρύπτεται μὲν ἄλιος, ὄρνυταί τε,
ὡχί δ', ὡς πρᾶν, Μέμνονος ἀμπὶ χορδαῖς
αἰθερίον φῶς

αὐθι κινάσει μέλας. ἀλλ' ἐτός μοι
τάκεται φράν' οὐποτ' ὅλοι' ἄν, ἔσται
ὠρανουχαὶ Πυραμίδες γαλανὰν
ἀέρος αὔραν

ἀτρέμας σχίσδοντι· τεὸς μὲν αἰῶν
ἰσοδαίμων σφῶν ἔσται τελευτᾷ,
καὶ τεᾷ σφός· ὀλλυμένων γάρ, ἅ χθῶν
ἐξαπολεῖται!

FRED. TENNYSON,

COLL. SS. TRIN. ALUMNUS.

NECROLOGY.

Biographical Memoir of MR. JOHN FOWLER HULL.

[Written for the CLASSICAL JOURNAL.]

"Quamquam sic amasti viventem, ut hæc audire potius, quam de illo sileri velis: a me præsertim, cujus prædicatione putas vitam ejus ornari, memoriam prorogari, ipsamque illam, qua est raptus, ætatem posse restitui."—PLINIUS COLONI.

A REMARKABLE instance of the success of unremitted *perseverance* in the acquirement of knowledge, may be adduced in the subject of this memoir. It is not however meant to be insinuated that he possessed *no original talent*: all that is intended is, that those who had watched the first dawn and exercise of his intellectual faculties, and who had the care of his education, never discovered that he was gifted by nature with those superior powers of mind, which are generally thought to constitute *genius*;—if indeed they are satisfied, on the retrospect, to allow him much more than is implied by mediocrity. His vast attainments, then, considering the comparatively short period of his life, in classical and oriental literature and general science, must be considered an

apt and striking illustration of the maxim held by several philosophers and metaphysicians, and by Horace :

Doctrina sed vim promovet insitam,
Rectique cultus pectora roborant.

It is to be regretted that our readers have no means of judging for themselves concerning the correctness of this assertion, from the circumstance of the individual in question having left no literary production behind him as the voucher of its reasonableness or truth: he seems, indeed, in this respect, to have totally neglected the suggestion of one of his favorite authors, and which now appears to have been particularly applicable to himself: "*quatenus nobis denegatur diu vivere, relinquamus aliquid quo nos vixisse testemur.*"

As it is, they will have to rely on the statements of the writer, who was long in habits of intimacy with him, so close indeed, at one time of life, (to which he often looks back with a feeling of the deepest satisfaction,) that he may adopt the impassioned language used by a late eminent scholar on a similar occasion: "If not the same cradle, yet we had from early life one and the same heart, one and the same soul!"

Mr. John Fowler Hull was born at Uxbridge, in 1801, of respectable parents, of the Society of Friends; his father, the late Samuel Hull, Esq. being a substantial miller and banker of that place. He was the youngest of four children; and in 1807 was sent to Epping School, a highly respectable establishment for youth of the same religious persuasion, conducted by Mr. Isaac Payne. Here he was not, *at first*, distinguished by any particular love for learning above other boys, nor on the whole for any superior quickness in the performance of his daily tasks. There was, however, something about him, a sort of determined perseverance in every thing he undertook, which frequently gained him the approbation of his tutors, and the notice of the master. His disposition was unassuming and amiable, and he consequently soon became the object of favorable attention among his school-fellows. After he had been with Mr. Payne four or five years, he grew more and more studious; a propensity to which, at last, he yielded so intensely, that he has been known to rise at three and four o'clock in the morning for months together, for the purpose of pursuing his studies; and his habit was, to continue them day after day with unremitted assiduity till the evening, allowing himself hardly any time for proper relaxation. He was sometimes obliged to be forced by his school-fellows from his desk, (which he bore with much good-humor,) when directed by the master to take that quantity of exercise which was thought absolutely necessary to preserve his health; and as this never seemed to suffer from such close application, it is pretty evident that he was originally blessed with a constitution not easily shaken.

By the time he was turned of thirteen years of age, beside the

different branches of a plain English education, he had become well versed in the French and Latin languages; and was able, by means of a French teacher who lodged in the house, to speak the former with great fluency; and he read daily considerable portions of Horace, Cicero, Livy, and Tacitus. He now commenced the study of the Greek tongue, which he pursued *con amore*, and with such ardor, that he began in a very short time to read the Greek Testament and Homer; in the course of a twelvemonth, Herodotus and Thucydides; and very soon after, the Greek Tragedians, in which he luxuriated. His chief favorite was Æschylus. Under the able classical teachers which Mr. P. then employed, he progressed very rapidly towards a profound acquaintance with the Greek and Roman classics; and one tutor in particular, under whose instructions he professed to have profited most, has been known to remark that much older pupils in some of the best grammar-schools in the kingdom fell far short of Mr. Hull in the quantity read at a lesson, as well as in the ease, correctness, and spirit, with which it was construed.

But it was not the unvaried routine of Greek and Latin translation that alone employed the subject of our memoir during this stage of his continuance at Epping School. To relieve the tedium of uniformity, and to give himself a readiness in the composition of Latin, he occasionally spent a few hours beyond those usually employed in Latin prose exercises, in composing original poetry after the manner of Horace, or in translating some of our most admired English odes, &c. into Latin hexameters. There was one version of his in particular, which, when it was considered that it proceeded from a lad hardly fourteen years of age, attracted at the time no ordinary notice and commendation. It was "Warton's Ode to Fancy;" some passages of which we shall here extract with the corresponding translation. It may be proper to remark, that the general spirit of this performance, though not equal in all its parts, and a few of the original images have been omitted, manifests a considerable intimacy with the manner of Virgilian poesy:

Now let us louder strike the lyre,
For my heart glows with martial fire;
I feel, I feel, with sudden heat,
My big tumultuous bosom beat,
The trumpet's clangors pierce mine ear,
A thousand widows' shrieks I hear:
Give me another horse, I cry;
Lo! the base Gallic squadrons fly, &c.

Jamque mihi pectus ferventi fluctuat æstu;
Protinus, exclamo, quæramus prælia dira;
Æris cornu clangor perfertur ad aures,
Horrendi et viduæ plangores æthera tidunt.
Quadrupedem, properi juvenes, alium, haud mora, ferte!
Gallica fœda caterva fugam capit ocyus Euro!

O queen of numbers, once again
 Animate some chosen swain ;
 Who, fill'd with unexhausted fire,
 May boldly strike the sounding lyre,
 May rise above the rhyming throng,
 And with some new unequal'd song,
 O'er all our list'ning passions reign,
 O'erwhelm our souls with joy and pain, &c.

Pectora, nympha, iterum tu vatis casta moveto
 Delecti ; sacre qui musæ concitus cestro
 Nunquam frigenti, possit componere chordis
 Blandisonos numeros, illustres vincere vates
 Carmine qui possit culto, qui dirigat omnes
 Affectus, &c.

The general fidelity and energy of these passages will be admitted ; but the word *culto*, in the last extract, seems too frigid an epithet for the original, which alludes to the “unequail'd song” of such master-spirits as Shakspeare.

The conversation of Mr. H. while at school, was not of that cast which characterises the generality of boys at that age. It was commonly on plans and resolutions for future advancement in learning—on the beauties of one author, and the style of another ; evidently showing that his mind was fully bent on the acquisition of what his ardent imagination prompted—to rival, if possible, the excellent Sir Wm. Jones, whom he would sometimes jokingly term his prototype—without entertaining at the time, it is believed, any idea that he should ever have it in his power to pursue his darling schemes so far as to realise in part, if not altogether, such an expectation, had it been formed and dwelt on. His manners at this period were remarkable for diffidence, frankness, and good-nature.

What contributed in some measure, probably, to keep alive that desire for knowledge, which had been so visibly kindled in him, was, that his father, kindly disposed to let his son enjoy every advantage while at school, gave general directions that he should be furnished with whatever books he might wish for. It was his intention, however, to call off the attention of his son, as soon as he left school, from books to business, which happened in the year 1816.

Though, on his quitting Epping, Mr. H. was, of course, compelled to submit to the directions of his friends as to his future mode of life, yet it is well known he did not entirely bid adieu to the enchantments of literature and science. All the leisure time he could command was at first devoted to the acquirement of Hebrew and Italian—to the reading of Locke and other metaphysicians—and to an insight into several branches of natural philosophy, astronomy, &c. &c. He would doubtless have preferred attending solely to these pursuits without any regard to business.

whatever; but this, under existing circumstances, could not be recommended: it is remarkable, however, that his duty and his inclination had not long to contend on this point. Not much more than a year after he had been at home, he had to mourn the loss of his eldest brother and sister by death, and soon after that of his excellent and affectionate father.

By these unexpected events, Mr. Hull came into the possession of very considerable property, sufficient to induce him to give up all ideas of trade, and to devote his whole time to his favorite studies. He accordingly fitted up a convenient room in his house as a library, for the reception of the most standard works in classical literature, together with those written in most of the languages of Europe, as well as of Asia; and in the prosecution of this object he spared no reasonable expense.

Some time in the year 1818, he entered on the study of the Eastern languages; and for this purpose repaired to Hertford, to take lessons of the professors at the Oriental College established there. Here he made great progress; and did not leave that place until he had obtained so thorough an insight into the different dialects of the East, as to enable him to pursue them alone.

Not long after his final return from Hertford College, the biographer visited him at Uxbridge, when he found him so very ardent in the acquisition of Arabic, Persian, Sanscrit, and Chinese, that he seemed to think every moment ill spent that could not be applied, in one way or another, to this primary object; insomuch that what is recorded of the elder Pliny may very emphatically be said of him:—“*perire omne tempus arbitrabatur, quod studiis non impertiretur.*” By way of change, however, he found opportunities of enlarging his acquaintance with Hebrew, as an auxiliary; and of perusing the best Greek authors, as Aristotle, Plato, Pindar, &c.; the last two being particularly regarded by him. The writer remembers Mr. H. mentioning to him, at this time, his opinion of the style of the first of them, which, though remarkably coincident with that of Gray in his Letters,¹ was not, it is believed, borrowed from it, but given as his own honest judgment, formed solely from having attentively read some parts of that abstruse philosopher.

Beside the languages already mentioned, he now found time to

¹ “He has a dry conciseness that makes one imagine one is perusing a table of contents, rather than a book.” Gray’s Letters, sect. 4. Let. 3. “The account Mr. Gray there gives of Aristotle’s writings,” says Twining, “though it is written with the sportive pleasantry of a familiar letter, is extremely just; except, perhaps, in one observation:—it seems hardly fair to conclude that Aristotle ‘lost himself,’ wherever his readers are now at a loss to find his meaning.”

look into several European, and made considerable advancement in German, Spanish, Russian, and Portuguese; a knowledge of the first of which he thought would, with his already acquired proficiency in French and Italian, enable him to travel more pleasantly; and that a continental tour might improve him in all. Accordingly, after some preliminary arrangements, he, in company with a relative, embarked for France; through which he passed on to some of the German districts, getting all the information he could on the journey, respecting the language and manners of the inhabitants, and greatly enjoying the scenery of the different countries. From Germany he proceeded, accompanied by his friend, to the mountains of Switzerland, and then to the north of Italy. The mountainous prospects of Switzerland particularly attracted his notice; being, as he used to observe, the best representations he had ever witnessed of the abstract ideas he had formed of extreme grandeur and sublimity. From the south of France he returned with his companion to Paris, who left him there, and proceeded to England. The French metropolis Mr. Hull found so well adapted for his object—that of gaining a competent knowledge of several tongues in which he did not yet consider himself a proficient—that he made a tarry in that city of some months; during which time he had uninterrupted access to all parts of the *Bibliothèque du Roi*, and introductions to Mons. Gail, and several other classical and oriental scholars of France. At his lodgings, while here, he was in the habit of daily receiving, for a few hours respectively, the best professors that could be found of Arabic, Italian, German, and some other languages.

From the middle of the year 1820 to the latter end of 1822, his time was pretty equally divided between Paris and Uxbridge: he would sometimes be at home for a few months, and then return to the French capital. During this period, he contrived to get together, at great expense, a number of rare and valuable oriental books and manuscripts. About this time also, he did not neglect to extend his stock of languages, whenever an opportunity presented of obtaining instruction from a native. He had already perused the grammar, and made some advances in the Dutch, modern Greek, Swedish, Icelandic, Turkish, and the dialects of Hindostanee and Bengalee.

In the spring of the year 1821, Mr. Hull was at home; and from a Latin correspondence with him about that time, it appears that though so young, he was not only familiar with the writings of our best classical scholars who flourished in times gone by, but that he was well acquainted with, and willing to do justice to, some of the most erudite of the present age. He thus addresses the writer in a letter, dated Kalend. Maii, 1821. "*Præter eos vero quos in epistola tua commemorasti tibi literarum, invicem Latine scribendarum auctores, habes et in præsenti tempore viros δεινόν-*

ταῖς μὲν κορυφαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀπὸ πασῶν, totiusque Angliæ eruditissimos; inter quos enumerari libet P. Elmsleium, H. Barkerum, necnon et omnis Minervæ hominem, S. Parrium."

On the return of Mr. H. from Paris, in the autumn of the year 1822, he brought with him, for the purpose of contracting a readiness at conversing in Arabic and other Eastern tongues; an Egyptian of some eminence. This person was born at Grand Cairo, and, if the writer mistakes not, had once been in the office of Oriental interpreter at the court of Napoleon. He remained with Mr. H. in England for some months; and then returned to the continent, much gratified with his visit, never having been in this country before.

In the summer of 1823, the subject of our memoir formed a resolution of visiting India. This had been a matter of contemplation with him, more or less, for some time past; but now, though somewhat in opposition to the wishes of some of his friends, he came to a final determination on it. His principal aim in such an undertaking was, to perfect himself in most of those Oriental tongues and dialects, of which he had already gained a considerable knowledge in Europe; and, in order to do this, as he thought, the more effectually, and as much as possible to avoid sailing, to which he had an aversion, he determined on an overland journey through Egypt. Accordingly, in the beginning of October of the same year, he departed, in company with an officer in the East-India service, travelling through France towards the Mediterranean, there to embark for the African coast; whither he arrived, with some difficulty, and where he was taken ill, or met with some accident. He gradually recovered, however, and pursued his way down the Red Sea to Mocha. He thence embarked for Bombay, and arrived there in a recovered state of health.

What were his first movements immediately after landing in India, the memorialist has no documents to show; and perhaps it may be unnecessary to give more than the substance of his proceedings and manner of living within a few months of his death. From a letter, dated January, 1826, received from a gentleman who had been applied to respecting some tidings of Mr. Hull, the following extracts not only give an interesting account of what he was doing at the time mentioned, but afford some probably well-founded conjectures as to his then future prospects. "His [Mr. H.'s] last letter is dated from Darwar, in the interior of Hindostan, between Bombay and Madras, on the 3rd of July, 1825. At this place he appears to have been more than a month at the date of his letter, the greater part of which time he had passed at the residence of two of his Indian acquaintance—but had then transferred his place of abode to the interior of two tents, the one used for sleeping in, the other for study and meals. His habits are regular; he rises in the morning at six, rides till eight, then dresses, and breakfasts at nine. He then meets two gentlemen, one

or both civil servants of the Company, to make experiments in chemistry, and for the construction of Galvanic batteries, &c. At twelve, he studies Sanscrit; at four his pundit arrives, and remains till six. He then walks, dines at seven, and closes the day by retiring at nine. This is his daily routine, and thus he appears to be employing his time agreeably to himself. I think that Indian literature has lost some of its charms in his view, although his correspondence evinces nothing of dissatisfaction in the prosecution of his journey, but quite the reverse. At Darwar he has four writers employed in copying manuscripts. With respect to his future plans, I know but little; as they must ever be subject to alteration, as circumstances point out one course as more desirable than another. After visiting the country to the south of Darwar, I imagine he will go to Madras; thence to Calcutta; perhaps to Canton and back; and, after an excursion into the interior towards Agra and Delhi, return to England, either by sea or through Persia."

But the plans here mentioned, if they had ever been under the consideration of Mr. H., were soon to be unhappily frustrated. On his leaving Darwar for a southerly direction, (whether for the purpose of seeing more of that part of the country, or of proceeding to some port in the south to embark for England, it is not certain,) on his arrival at the village of Sigaum, about forty miles from Darwar, he was taken alarmingly ill with a fever incident to the climate, which increased so rapidly on him as to terminate his existence before medical aid could arrive, on the 18th of December, 1825, in the twenty-fifth year of his age.

From his journal and other documents now in the possession of his friends, it appears that his death in these distant regions was not altogether unexpected by him; and there is reason to apprehend that his mind had been under a religious and resigned state some time previous to this very afflictive occurrence.

His library was left by will to different individuals; some portions of it to his friends and relations; but the Oriental department to the trustees of the British Museum, by whom it is highly and deservedly appreciated. This consists of rather more than one hundred and twenty manuscripts, and about six hundred volumes of printed books, many of both of which are of great curiosity. The manuscript collection is very rich in Persian poetry, and some of the manuscripts illuminated in the best oriental style. Beside Persian, there are many other Mss. in the collection in the Sanscrit, Chinese, Arabic, and Hindostanee languages; and one containing the *Shah Nameh* is particularly valued.

The various languages with which Mr. Hull was more or less acquainted, the writer is enabled, from a list in the hand-writing of his friend, to class pretty nearly according to the order and proficiency in which they were learnt:

{ English, French, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Persian, }
 { Arabic, Sanscrit, Chinese. }

{ Spanish, Portuguese, German, Dutch, Modern Greek, Hin- }
 { dostanee, Bengalee, Russian, Syriac, Chaldee. }
 { Swedish, Icelandic, Turkish, Mid. Arabic, Malayan, Ethiopic, }
 { Coptic, Samaritan, Gaelic, Anglo-Saxon. }

The memory of Mr. H. must of course have become very retentive, and his mind very assimilating, to prevent any intermixture or confusion of the words and idioms of one language with those of another; and perhaps a better instance than himself cannot be adduced to exhibit the improvement the memory is capable of from constant application and exercise. He has often, in mentioning this circumstance to the biographer, contrasted the strength of his memory at a later period with what it was when at school; being fully of the opinion entertained by some eminent men, among whom we may reckon Sir Wm. Jones and Sir Isaac Newton, that the memory and some other faculties of the mind may be enlarged and improved to an extent far beyond what is generally thought possible.

But however great his attainments in learning were, they were equalled, if not excelled, by a uniformly kind, amiable, and unassuming disposition, perhaps never surpassed by any other individual. His company was enlivening by a ready and playful wit. His generosity was unlimited; and, being in the enjoyment of a considerable income, he was able to dispense his bounty with a liberal hand. Few applications were ever made to him on behalf of the indigent, the unfortunate, or the deserving, without success. The poor in his neighborhood have cause long to remember him, while many charitable institutions have not escaped his notice and liberality: finally, it may be said, of him in the language of a Grecian bard—

Ἐκεῖνος ὅσα χάριμα' ἔλ-

λοῖς ἔθηκεν, τὴν ἂν φράσαι δύναται;

T. G.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS on GREEK, LATIN, and CELTIC WORDS, in a Letter to a Friend, from the REV. THOS. PRICE, of Crickhowel, (Vicar of Cwmdy, Brecknockshire,) containing some Strictures on COL. KENNEDY'S "Researches into the Origin and Affinity of Languages."

As you wish to know some reasons for the opinion which I lately expressed respecting Colonel Vans Kennedy's system of philology, the following are offered from among several others.

On inspection of the Table of Contents, it appeared that the author had devoted a whole chapter to his examination of the Celtic; and as that was a subject very interesting to me, and most within the scope of my comprehension, I immediately proceeded to ascertain in what manner he treated it; and found so many errors and mis-statements, that I cannot place confidence in any of his assertions concerning those languages with which I am less intimately acquainted.

For instance, in the Colonel's work (page 80), the following statement is made:

"In the preceding hundred Celtic words, all primitives, and likely to occur in the most unimproved tongues, not one bears the remotest resemblance to the terms with which they are compared in six different languages. When, therefore, Celtic etymologists find it impossible to effect even the appearance of an identification of Celtic words with those of other languages, except by arbitrary changes, which are altogether inadmissible; and when the words which are unquestionably Celtic have not the slightest correspondence with those of any other tongue, it may be justly concluded that not a single language of Europe or Asia has been derived from the Celtic, or has even the least affinity with it."

Now, on reference to these hundred words, I found that the author had been at extraordinary pains to collect from the Celtic, and six other languages, synonymous words the most dissimilar in sound, to support his hypothesis respecting the difference of origin between the Celtic and those languages. But on examining the hundred words, I can at the first glance perceive that the major part of them prove the direct contrary of what the author advances, and establish a strong affinity between the Celtic and several of the other six languages. I will take, for example, the Greek and Latin columns as contrasted with the Welsh, and there I find the following words:

Verus (Latin), *Cywir* (Welsh). I must confess there is not much resemblance between these words; but it may be asked why has the author gone out of his way for the word *cywir*, which has but the secondary meaning of *verus*? It signifies *correct*, and is not a primitive as he asserts, but a compound of *gwir*. Why did he not take the first word in the dictionary for *true*, i. e. *gwir*? as this is the only term used in common discourse signifying *true*, and is evidently the same with *verus*; and here his own digamma would establish the identity of the Latin V and the Welsh GW.

Akoveiv (Greek), *clwyd* (Welsh). Here the dissimilarity is still greater; but if the Colonel had consulted a lexicon, he might have found the word *κλῦω* corresponding with the Welsh *clwyd*, "to hear."

Ventus, Lat. *Chwyth*, W. Here again he does not give the usual and real Welsh word for *wind*, i. e. *gwynt*; the identity of which with the Latin *ventus* would be explained by the digamma;

but he finds out *chwyth*, “a blowing:” the last word given in the dictionary among the synonyms of “wind.”

Scutum, Lat. *Tarian*, W. Here he takes the first term that offers, undoubtedly on account of its dissimilarity to the Latin, and discards its synonym *ysgwyd*, which closely resembles *scutum*, and seems to be derived from the Welsh *ysgwydd*, “a shoulder.”

Rex, Lat. *Llywydd*, W. Now *llywydd* signifies a governor, or “gubernator,” from *llyw*, a helm; the same with the Latin *clavus*; and is never used to signify a king: and nothing but a determination to support a system could induce any person, however slightly acquainted with the language, to insert it under that meaning, except as a secondary synonym. The Welsh word corresponding to *rex* is *rhi*, “a king.”

Lac, Lat. *Llueth*, W. Had Colonel Kennedy inserted the oblique case *lactis*, the difference of sound would not have been so great.

Senex, Lat. *Coeth*, W. Why has our author not given the regular word *hen*, which would have corresponded with the Latin, as the S is often found prefixed in Latin and Irish words, when in the Welsh and Greek it is not seen; as,

Latin.	Irish.	Welsh.	Greek.
Senis.	Sean.	Hen.	
Sal.	Sail.	Hal.	Ἄλς.
Sol.		Haul.	Ἡλιος.
Sator.		Hadwr.	&c.

Δακρυειν, Greek, *Cwynvan*, W. Was the Colonel ignorant that the Welsh for shedding tears is *dagru*? The word *cwynvan* has no reference to shedding of tears, but is derived from *cwyn*, “a complaint;” and signifies “to complain.”

Vacca, Lat. *Myswynog*, W. Of all the far-fetched words introduced to support a system, this is the most preposterous. *Myswynog* is a compound word, used to signify a “winter milch cow,” called a *barren*. The proper Welsh for *vacca* is *vuwch*; nom. *buwch*.

Dare, Lat. *Rhoddi*, W. When it suits the author, he gives the leading word; but had he also given the words *do* and *donum*, we might have supplied him with the corresponding Welsh, *doniau*. The word *rhoddi* is allied to *reddo*.

Videre, Lat. *Gweld*, W. Had the Colonel inquired, he might have found the Welsh *gwyddaw*, “to become perceptible.”

Επειν, Greek, *dywedyd*, W. He might also have found the Welsh *ebe*, “he said.”

Implere, Lat. *Llenwi*, W. Had he given the simple words *pleo* and *plenus*, he might have established an affinity with *llenwi*, the Latin *pl* being represented by the Welsh *ll*.

Mors, Lat. *Angeu*, W. Here should have been *morior*, Lat. *marw*, W. The word *angeu* seems to be the same with the Latin *angor*.

Calidus, Lat. *Cynnes*, W. We have also *clyd*, "warm." *Cynnes* is a compound, and not a primitive, as the Colonel states.

Sagitta, Lat. *Hobel*, W. Had he inserted *sacth*, "an arrow," we might have discovered a resemblance. I know not why he inserted *hobel*.

Malus, Lat. *Drwg*, W. We have also *mall*, "evil."

Ensis, Lat. *Cleddyv*, W. Why not put *gladius* opposite to *cleddyv*, "a sword?"

Dens, Lat. *Ysgythyrr*, W. *Ysgythyrr* properly signifies a "fang," or the "eye-tooth;" but the usual word for a tooth is *dant*, corresponding with *dens*, *dentis*.

Acutus, Lat. *Llym*, W. Why not give *acuo*, Lat. *awchu*, Welsh?

Cauda, Lat. *Cynffon*, W. This word is a compound: our author might have given the Welsh *cwt* for *cauda*, "a tail."

Mare, Lat. *Ltyr*, W. *Ltyr* signifies the "sea-shore," and answers to *littus*, *littoris*: the Welsh for *mare* is *môr*, "the sea."

Ferre, Lat. *Dwyn*, W. *Dwyn*, in another tense, becomes *dygwyn*, W. *duco*, Latin.

Urere, Lat. *Llosgi*, W. Had he given the participle *ustus*, we might have supplied him with the Welsh *ysi*, "to burn."

Such are the boasted words, whose formidable phalanx was to overthrow all pretensions of the Celtic to an affinity with any other language of Europe or Asia. Having discovered so many errors in a few lines, can you be surprised at the opinion which I expressed concerning Colonel Kennedy's work? Indeed, if this author would indulge me with the same privilege that he himself has assumed in the preceding comparisons, I could undertake to prove that High and Low Dutch are of origins totally different; that Hebrew and Arabic have no resemblance; in short, that Shakspeare and Milton used languages totally and radically distinct, or any other philological absurdity that might be proposed: and as the latter is most applicable to the present subject, I shall give you a specimen of the manner in which such an absurdity might be easily accomplished.

Shakspeare.

Spear.

Steed.

Welkin.

Ocean.

* Upset.

Milton.

Lance.

Horse.

Sky.

Sea.

Overthrow, &c.

I assure you this is not a more unfair mode of comparison than that which Colonel Kennedy has used in his "Researches," at least

as far as the Celtic is concerned. But he makes another assertion, which I cannot by any means reconcile with his claim to philological knowledge; for in p. 81. he has the following note:

“As far as I have observed, there seems, with a few solitary exceptions only, to be no Greek words in Celtic, except such as are cognate with the Latin; and it is therefore most probable that they were derived immediately through this language, and not directly from the Greek. *Γραφειν* is the only Greek word not cognate with the Latin which I have remarked; but there may be others.”

Now I could supply you with whole columns of words which would, I am confident, satisfy any reasonable inquirer that the author's opinion is totally unfounded. Take, for instance, the following from the Greek and the Welsh, which resemble each other so nearly both in sound and signification, that their identity of origin must be established beyond a possibility of doubt; and yet I think the Colonel himself would be puzzled to show how the Welsh could have received these words through the medium of Latin, as I cannot discover any corresponding Latin words.

Greek.

Βορα, food.
Μεθυ, wine.
Μεθυω, to be drunk.
Φορβη, pasture.
Οιν, a sheep.
Καλεω, to call.
Βραχω, to resound.
Κραυω, to beat.
Ηαιω, to beat.
Μολος, a tumult.
Λοχος, an ambush.
Κευθω, to hide.
Κλυω, to hear.
Λιω, to hear.
Δερκω, *δραχω*, to look.
Ηλιος, anciently *ηλ*, the sun.
Φαω, to shine.
Τυφλος, blind.
Γραικη, fem. of *Γραικος*, *anilis* (Lat.)
Τερην, tender.
Ηρεμος, placid.
Ραδιος, easy.
Ταχυ, quickly.
Ανωγω, to command.
Φλαω, to smash.
Ωθεω, to push.
Βαλλω, to cast.

Welsh.

Βαρα, bread.
Μεδδ, mead.
Μεδδwi, to get drunk.
Πορβα, pasture.
Οεν, a lamb.
Γατω, to call.
Βροχι, to make a loud noise.
Κυρω, to beat.
Πυω, to beat.
Μολοχ, a tumult.
Λλοches, a lurking place.
Κυδδw, to hide.
Κλυעד, to hear.
Οiaw, to hear.
Δρυχyu, to look.
Ηαυ, the sun.
Εφawn, to shine.
Τywyll, dark-blind.
Γwyrach, an old woman.
Τιριον, tender.
Αραw, gentle.
Ρhwydd, easy.
Τoc, quickly.
Αnnogi, to incite.
Εflawu, to smash.
Wthio, to push, v. *gwrthio*.
Βαlu, to shoot out.

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>
Φρεαρ, a well.	<i>Efreuaw</i> , to spout out.
Ρεω, to flow.	<i>Rhean</i> , a stream.
Λιμνη, a lake.	<i>Llyn</i> , a lake.
Κυμβος, a concavity.	<i>Cwm</i> , a valley.
Καμπω, to bend.	<i>Cammu</i> , to bend.
Κυκλος, a circle.	<i>Cylch</i> , a circle.
Δρυς, an oak.	<i>Derw</i> , an oak.
Σκολοψ, a pointed stake.	<i>Yscolp</i> , a pointed stake.
Κολουω, to cut off.	<i>Callu</i> , to cut.
Μανος, slender.	<i>Mân</i> , small.
Γενυς, the chin.	<i>Gen</i> , the chin.
Κοιλια, the belly.	<i>Cylla</i> , the stomach.
Γερανός, a crane.	<i>Garan</i> , a crane, from <i>gar</i> , a shank.
Ετι, yet.	<i>Etto</i> , yet.
Ιδιος, one's own.	<i>Eiddo</i> , one's own.
Βουλη, counsel.	<i>Pwyll</i> , deliberation, &c. &c.

But it is not merely in single words that a resemblance may be found between the Greek and Welsh; there is likewise a striking identity in the roots of the two languages which pervades their very structure. The following may serve as an example:

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>
Αω, to flow.	<i>Aw</i> , a flowing.
Αω, to breathe.	{ <i>Awel</i> , a gale.
Αελλα, a tempest.	
Αων, the sea-shore.	{ <i>Awon</i> , } a river.
Αυλος, a pipe.	
Αοιδος, a song.	{ <i>Awen</i> , poetical inspiration.

The same root may also be traced through a variety of words in both languages.

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>
Ρεω, to flow.	<i>Rheu</i> , to run.
Ρευμα, a flowing.	<i>Rhean</i> , a stream.
	<i>Rhed</i> , a course.
	<i>Rhe</i> , a run.
	<i>Rhedeg</i> , to run, &c.

Now here the resemblance is preserved even to the aspirate *rh*; and the same distinction is recognised in both languages between *aw*, "to flow gently," and *ρῆω*, "to flow rapidly." I could likewise adduce many resemblances which the Welsh could not have derived through the Latin, as they are not only words unknown in that language, but of a dialect utterly foreign to the genius of the Latin; as in the following numerals:—

Notice of Cardwell's *Nicomachean Ethics*. 273

Pedwar signifies "four" in Welsh: it was *περοπα* in the old Greek: now the Latin being *quatuor*, it is evident that the word could not have been derived from the Latin.

The Welsh for "five" is *pump*; and in the old Greek, *πεντε*. Is it by any means probable that the Welsh could have acquired this resemblance through the Latin *quinque*? But this word, like many others, would afford a curious chase if tracked through the Greek, Teutonic, and Latin; as Greek, *πεντε*, Welsh, *pump*, German, *funf*, and (by the digamma) Latin, *quinque*.

Such are a few of the reasons which induced me to differ with you in opinion respecting the merits of Colonel Vans Kennedy's Philological "Researches;" and hoping that you will find them sufficient to justify the expressions used by me in conversation on the subject of that work, I remain,

Yours, &c.

T. PRICE.

Crickhowel, Oct. 21, 1828.

NOTICE OF CARDWELL'S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

ARISTOTELIS ETHICORUM NICOMACHEORUM LIBRI DECEM. Ad codicum et veterum editionum fidem recognovit, varias lectiones adjecit, notis nonnunquam suis plerumque aliorum illustravit, indicè denique ubèriore ornavit EDVARDUS CARDWELL, S. T. B. Coll. Æn. Nas. Socius, necnon Historiarum Prælector Camdenianus. Vol. i. Oxonii. 1828. pp. xxviii. 310.

THERE is perhaps no writer to whom one recurs with so much pleasure as Aristotle. His concise and sometimes crabbed style, his close and powerful argumentation, his habitual contempt for all ornament and frequently of all illustration, somewhat perplex and confound the reader at a first perusal. But when the difficulty is once overcome, when the scope of the arguments and plan of the work have been once clearly perceived, then the mind feels that pleasure of learning much in a small space and time, which never will be found on returning to an author who is more diligent in explanation, and who can be thoroughly understood at a first reading. It is the same with a mathematical work; a demonstration, which takes a learner some time and pains to follow

when first read, will, when once made out, be comprehended at a glance. The style of Aristotle is however inconvenient to many readers, and would to most writers be most dangerous: as few could assure themselves that the value of the information afforded would repay the reader for his trouble, and consequently their works would be neglected as useless.

These remarks have been suggested to us by looking over a new edition of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which has been lately published by Mr. Cardwell, the successor of Dr. Elmsley in the Camdenian Lectureship of History at Oxford. The first volume only has appeared, containing a notice of the Mss. editions, translations, &c. of this treatise of Aristotle's, taken from Zell's edition; a short summary of the plan of the treatise; the text with various readings at the bottom of the page; and a short preface, which we will give entire in the editor's own words.

Damus tibi in manus, L. R., novam Ethicorum Nicomacheorum editionem; et quid in ea adornanda et consilii initium et laboris impensum est, modice id a nobis expositum volumus, et a te humaniter acceptum.

Etenim subsidia, quæ omnibus illam partibus et numeris absolverent, neque multa neque idonea comparavimus. Tristem profecto neque cum singularem exitum habuit Aristoteles, qui innumeris commentationibus atque omnibus pene linguis tractatus, majus idcirco ipse in discrimen venerit. Multi enim sunt commentarii e quibus lectiones ejus refici posse videntur, iidem vero, siquando ad textum admoveantur, in diversas et quidem contrarias partes singuli abeunt; pauca sunt vetusta exemplaria, in quibus vera magistri vestigia contueri possumus.

Hoc ideo nobis propositum est, ut misso quodcumque conjectura augurati sunt vel critici male feriat, vel interpretes nimia perspicuitati studentes, eas solummodo lectiones sequeremur, quæ codicum optimorum et editionum principum auctoritate niterentur. Ea enim ratione ducti, siquidem ad angustiorum verborum seriem, et adstrictiorem hic illic sensum rediremus, nimirum haberemus textum clara vetustatis indicia ferentem, quique magis et Athenas et Aristotelem saperet. Subsidia igitur, quibus in hac editione adornanda usi sumus, hæc sunt:

L. Codex Ms. Laurentianus, in bibliotheca Medicea Florentia servatus (Cod. xi. Plut. lxxx. ap. Bandin. Catal. T. 3. p. 226.) et sæculo decimo exaratus. Una cum *Nicomacheis* continet *Moralia Magna*,

¹ The Great Ethics were so called, we suppose, for the same reason as that so satisfactorily alleged by one of Dryden's heroes for the size of his hurt, viz. "My wound's so great because it is so small." They are, in fact, much the shortest of Aristotle's three Ethical treatises, and appear to have been the first sketch of the philosopher; and while they are interesting, as showing the progress of his changes and improvements, are useful also as a compendium of his larger and more complete work, now published by Mr. Cardwell. We therefore regret that, as the editor had the collation of the best Ms. in existence, he did not prefix this short treatise to his edition. In Sylburg's edition, the Great Ethics occupy 77 pages; the *Nicomachean* 192: Mr. Cardwell need therefore have only increased his book by 125 pages.

atque omnium, quotquot hodie comparent, codicum Aristotelicorum antiquissimus est. Editionis nostræ in usum minutam hujus codicis collationem fieri curavimus.

C. Editio Camotiana, sive Aldina minor, Venetiis ap. Aldum filium annis 1551-1553 impressa, et omnia Aristotelis opera sex voll. complexa.

I. Editio Isingriniana, Basileæ anno 1550 impressa, et uno vol. conclusa.

S. Editio Sylburgiana Francofurti ap. heredes Andreæ Wecheli anno 1584 impressa, et opera doctissimi viri Petri Victorii emendata. Hujus est textus qui ad nostra usque tempora ab editoribus vulgo receptus est.

Horum librorum omnium diligenter collationem fecimus, et varietatem lectionis, ubicunque exorta sit, textui subjecimus. Textum vero ipsum, Sylburgianæ editionis vestigia sequentem, nusquam, quoad fas erat, ad codicis Laurent. fidem ductumque non revocavimus. Codex certe Parisiensis (Biblioth. Reg. No. 1417) cujus collationem cum Zellio communicavit Schweighæuserus; commodis nostris aliquando inservivit; sed Laurentianum illum, nisi si quid insit vel hiatus vel erroris manifesti, quasi ducem nobis prefecimus, utpote qui in his rebus, Tullii quodammodo auctoritate et exemplo, cum antiquis balbutire malleamus, quam cum hodiernis discrete loqui. Nonnulla idcirco sunt loca, L. B., in quibus pristinam verborum copiam frustra fortasse quæras; multa sunt, in quibus nullam mutationis causam, nisi sacrum illum vetustatis amorem detegas; plurima autem, in quibus et eximie verborum renovationes, et inter puncta de integro oratio chartis nostris Aristotelicis nonnulli lucis attulerint, et tuos in optimis his studiis progressus melius et expeditius possint deducere. Vale.

The editor, therefore, (as the reader sees) has only made use of one manuscript, but that seems to be of very high authority, and to be singly (as far as we can judge from the various readings) of more value than all the Mss. which have as yet been either printed or compared. He also gives a collation of three editions, the Aldine of 1551, the Basle of 1550, and Sylburg's. We confess that we do not see why he should have preferred these printed copies (the last of which generally agrees with one or other of the two first) to the other Mss. which have been collated. For instance, the Paris Ms., of which the varieties are given in Zell's edition, is not to our knowledge once mentioned, though the learned editor says that he has *sometimes availed himself of it*. Mr. Guelmus Wilkinson also gives a certain number of readings from two Oxford Mss., which we think would have rendered the editor a much better return for his labor than two of the printed books which he has compared. The same person also made use of a Ms. from the Museum "Johannis Mori Episcopi Ehen-sis;" which is, we suppose, at Cambridge with the other Mss. of that learned prelate. See Heyne's Homer, vol. iii. p. xl., Dobree's Preface to Photius, p. x. The editor seems also to have some scruple about restoring

1 The Florence Ms. has a hiatus from x. 5. 9. to x. 7. 4. making four of the printed pages of this edition. Mr. Cardwell has neglected to

the text to its genuine state, and to think an apology necessary for rejecting those glosses which the industry of commentators noted on the margin and the carelessness of scribes promoted into the text. If this has the effect of rendering the text more concise and less perspicuous, it is the business of the interpreter to remove all obscurities and declare the sense. But it is clearly the duty of the verbal critic to find out, not the easy, but the authentic reading, not what the author *ought* to have written, but that which he really *did write*.

We will now endeavor to give the reader some idea of the changes and improvements in the text introduced by Mr. Cardwell, by which he will be enabled to judge both of the value of the new manuscript, and the use which the learned editor has made of it; at the same time we shall take the liberty of offering some remarks of our own, which, though they will chiefly be on verbal and grammatical questions, may be permitted in a Journal specially devoted to *classical literature*.

1. 1. 1. ἀπεφάνηται. We are in doubt whether this is intentional, or a mere error of the press:

1. 5. 8. καὶ πολλοὶ λόγοι πρὸς αὐτὴν καταβίβληται. Thus Mr. Cardwell from the Florence Ms. We prefer, however, the old reading, καὶ τοὶ πολλοί.

1. 6. 8. Ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ἄλλος ἔσται λόγος. The particles μὲν οὖν generally signify *now*, and sometimes *however*; but we do not remember to have ever seen them joined with ἀλλά: we would therefore read ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων, &c.

1. 7. 6. φύσει πολιτικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The article is restored from the Florence Ms. Thus ix. 9. 3. πολιτικὸν γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, where all the copies agree.

1. 8. 7. οὐδετέρους δὲ τούτων εὐλογον διαμαρτάνειν τοῖς ὅλοις, ἀλλ' ἔν γέ τι, τὰ πλείστα κατορθοῦν. Thus Mr. Cardwell from the Florence Ms.; and we certainly think that he has succeeded to the utmost of his wishes in making the text *balbutire*, though we question whether it is *cum antiquis*. The Basle edition and three Mss. have ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τι καὶ τὰ πλείστα. The Aldine and the margin of the Paris Ms. have ἀλλ' ἔν γέ τι ἢ τὰ πλείστα. One Ms. has ἀλλ' ἔν γέ τι ἢ καὶ τὰ πλείστα, which appears to be the right reading. Thus in iv. 5. 11. Mr. Cardwell reads from the Florence Ms. ἀνευ τιμωρίας ἢ καὶ κολάσεως, where one Ms. has καὶ κολάσεως, and Mr. Cardwell's three editions ἢ κολάσεως only.

inform us whether a leaf or leaves have been torn out, or whether the text is continuous. This would have afforded some means of judging of the *families* of Mss. (as they are called), and whether those of inferior value were derived from this or some other archetype. It is almost unnecessary to remark that the assistance of these would have been valuable in the absence of the chief guide.

1. 9. 3. φαίνεται δὲ, κἂν εἰ μὴ θεόπεμπτός ἐστιν ἄλλα δι' ἀρετὴν παρὰγίνεται, τῶν θεωμάτων εἶναι. Read either καὶ εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ μὴ. The present text seems to contain two solecisms. We shall notice a similar error below, vii. 7. 1.

1. 9. 11. Καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἡρωικοῖς περὶ Πριάμου μυθεύεται. Mr. Cardwell restores *Τρωϊκοῖς* (which, by the way, should be printed *Τρωικοῖς*) from the Florence Ms. It is perhaps our ignorance, but we do not at this moment remember any passage in which *τὰ Τρωϊκά* is used for an *account* of the Trojan war. We should therefore hesitate about receiving this reading, particularly as above H and T are confounded in the same Ms. In 8. 16. it has *ΠΤΩΜΕΝΟΙ* for *ΤΥΤΩΜΕΝΟΙ*. It may be said that, by the same analogy (*τὰ ἡρωϊκά* means an account of the heroic age, *Τρῶν* signifies an account of the Trojan war), but custom seems to have limited the use of the latter word, as it frequently occurs; and the other is in this place supported by the authority of many manuscripts.

1. 12. 8. δὲα τὸ εἶναι ἀρχή. The Florence Ms., an *antiquus fidelique liber* of Victorius, and a Ms. collated by Wilkinson, have ἀρχή; which should, in our opinion, be received. See the passages quoted in Zell's note.

1. 13. 5. περὶ ἀρετῆς δὲ λεπτοτέρως. Perhaps περὶ ἀρετῆς δὲ ἵπτος. We would also read *λεπτεῖται* δὲ above, 7. 13.

1. 13. 12. Ἀνθρωπινὴ is restored from the Florence Ms. for ἀνθρωπινή. It should be written ἀνθρωπίνη (as it stands in Zell's Paris Ms.); and below 11. 12. perhaps we should read ἀνθρωπίνης ἀρετῆς. Ἀνθρωπινός, however, occurs eleven times in this treatise.² The same restoration is made, and the same correction is required, in vii. 5. 8.

Ibid. δαεῖσθαι. Zell, in the innocence of his heart, seems to have thought that this was a verb. "Uterpater," he says, "*hoc loco verbum compositum intransitivum, qua significatione etiam simplex δηλοῦν apud scriptores reperitur.*" Compare Polit. p. 371 A. οὐδὲν γὰρ διάδηλος ὁ πλοῦσιος καὶ ὁ πένης, as should be read for ἄδηλος from a Paris Ms. in Goettling's edition; which perhaps is an authority for preferring in this place the singular number, which is found in some Mss. Comp. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 1.

11. 1. 1. μῦθον περιγελῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθους. We would read *παρεκκλῖνον*. See Schneider's Greek Lexicon in that word.

11. 1. 2. Every where else, as far as we have observed, Mr. Cardwell writes *οὐδεμία*, and οὐδεὶς not οὐδ' εἷς (except οὐδ' ἓνα, iv. 1. 32.) So too in iii. 6. 12. he writes οὐδ' ἕτερον, but οὐδετέρους, 1. 8. 7. οὐδέτερον, iv. 1. 31. οὐδέτερον, iv. 9. 5, &c.

¹ Thus τὰ Μηδικὰ means the Persian war. Ctesias called his Description of Persia *Περσικά*.

² The form ἀνθρωπίνος is also twice used; once in all the editions x. 4. 9. and once on the authority of the Florence Ms. x. 9. 22.

11. 2. 2. Mr. Cardwell writes ὑποκείσθω for ὑπέρκεισθω, from his Ms. and the margin of the Basle edition. We very much doubt this use of ὑπόκειμαι for "to be deferred," "to lie over." This sense would be exactly given by the preposition ὑπέρ; and it seems much more probable that the common ὑπόκειμαι than the uncommon ὑπέρκειμαι should have been improperly introduced by the transcribers.

11. 6. 5. We confess we do not see what reason Mr. Cardwell has for always writing ταὐτὸ and not ταὐτόν. See 11. 6. 5. 11. 8. 10, 15. 111. 2. 11, 16. v. 10. 1, 2. v. 2. 9, 11. vi. 1. 6. vi. 8. 1. vi. 13. 1. vii. 3. 2. vii. 13. 4. viii. 12. 3. but ταὐτόν 1. 2. 8. Neither do we understand why he should sometimes write αἰεὶ and sometimes αἰεί. See 1. 7. 4, 5. i. 10. 13. 11. 3. 10. iv. 1. 3. v. 1. 9. bis. vii. 14. 8. In all the other places where this word occurs it is written αἰεί. Porson's rule has been called in question as applied to the early poets, Æschylus for example; but no one, we believe, has doubted its truth with regard to so late a prose writer as Aristotle. Dindorf, indeed, says generally, (Præf. ad Soph. p. 57.) "*Electræ versu 218. et alio quodam in loco me invito relictæ est αἰεὶ Ionica forma, quam ex Homero in recentioribus scriptorum Atticorum codicibus intulerunt librarii. Ἄεὶ magna constantia tueretur Aristophanis liber Ræccennas, Sophoclis Laurentiani A et V, et quidquid usquam veterum et bonorum codicum cum editis exemplaribus accuratius collatum est.*"

11. 7. 2. ἀνδρεία. The Florence Ms. and Sylburg's edition read ἀνδρία. The late Dr. Elmsley, (*Class. Journ.* vol. viii. p. 211.) had no doubt that this word should be written ἀνδρεία, like βασιλεία, δουλεία, &c. Goettling, however, ad Aristot. Polit. p. 288. says, *Si substantiva descendunt a nominibus, quorum litera primigenia est liquida aut muta, exeunt in ia, ἀνδρία ab ἀνής (ἀνδρ-ός); nam si esset ab ἀνδρείος, pronuntiari debebat ἀνδρεῖα.* Which is evidently an inconclusive argument; as he uses the same reason to *disprove* the form ἀνδρεία, which Dr. Elmsley uses to *prove* it. In Æsch. Theb. 52. ἀνδρεία φλέγων is read without any variety. But in Thucyd. i. 83. all the editions and Mss. have ἀνανδρία; nor are we aware that the word ἀνανδρεία is any where found. We conceive, however, that the other is regularly derived from the adjective ἀνανδρος, as ἀνδρεία is from the adjective ἀνδρείος. This shorter form of the negatory adjective is (it should be observed) quite agreeable to analogy: thus we have λόγος, λόγιμος, ἄλογος not ἀλόγιμος; μῦθος, μύριμος, ἄμωρος not ἀμύριμος, &c. See Boeckh in Platonis Minorem p. 53. However, be this as it may, we would read without hesitation βοηθία and ὠφελία, as being derived either from βοηθός and ὠφέλος, or from βοηθῶ and ὠφελῶ. See Goettling l. c. and Bekker Præf. ad Thuc. p. iv. ed. Oxon. 1824.

11. 7: 13. περὶ δὲ τὸ ἡδὺ τὸ μὲν ἐν παιδιᾷ . . . ἢ ὑπερβολὴ βωμο-

λοχία. Cited by Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 900. βωμολοχία δὲ κυρίως ἢ περὶ τὸ ἐν παιδιᾷ ἢ δὲ, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἰσοκῶν.

III. 1. 14. "Ἐτερὸν δὲ ἔοικε καὶ τὸ δι' ἄγνοϊαν πράττειν τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας. Thus the Florence Ms. : the Aldine and Basle editions have τοῦ ἀγνοοῦντος, Sylburg's τοῦ ἀγνοοῦντα ποιεῖν. Read τοῦ ἀγνοοῦντας; and see Elmsl. ad. Med. 865. Nothing is more common than this mistake *per attractionem*. Thus we have in the Florence Ms. in v. 3. 12. τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον for τοῦ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον.

III. 1. 17. κίσιριν. This is the reading of the Florence Ms. for κίσσηριν, which is evidently wrong, as Aristotle would have written κίσσηριν. Thus καττιτέρωνος, Soph. Elench. p. 421. ed. Sylburg.¹ There is, however, ample authority for writing the word κίσσηρις and not κίσιρις, as the editor may see by referring to the article κίσσηρις in the new edition of Stephens's Thesaurus, p. 5006, and the numerous authorities there quoted, to which may be added Cherochoscus in Bekker's Anecdota p. 1389.

Ibid. ἀποκτείνειν ἄν. Perhaps, on account of the hiatus, ἀποκτείναν ἄν; though there is no objection to ἀποκτείνειν ἄν with πατάξειν ἄν. See below III. 5. 15.

III. 1. 27. Aristotle wishes to prove that those actions which are done from appetite or anger are not involuntary. After some arguments, he concludes thus : ἔτι δὲ τί διαφέρει τῷ ἀκούσια εἶναι τὰ κατὰ λογισμὸν ἢ θυμὸν ἀμαρτηθέντα; φευκτὰ μὲν γὰρ ἅμφω. "*Again*," says the philosopher, "*how do the errors of judgment, or those arising from anger, differ as to their being voluntary or involuntary? For they are equally to be avoided.*" Δοκεῖ δὲ, he continues, οὐχ ἥττον ἀνθρωπικὰ εἶναι τὰ ἄλογα πάθη ὥστε καὶ αἱ πράξεις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἴσους τὸ τιθέναι ἀκούσια ταῦτα. Thus the passage stands in the Florence Ms. and we interpret it as follows. "*Neither do the passions not under the control of reason appear to belong less properly to man than those which are. Consequently the actions resulting from them are those of a man (ἢ ἀνθρώπος). It is therefore absurd to call them involuntary.*" The annotator, however, who wrote on the margin the common text, seems to have given a different and (as we think) a worse interpretation of this passage. The editions have (instead of ὥστε καὶ αἱ πράξεις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), αἱ δὲ πράξεις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας, which taken in its literal and obvious sense is absurd.

III. 2. 8. Read δι' αὐτοῦ, and below 3. 17. read αὐτὸν and αὐτοῦ.

III. 2. 17. ἀλλ' ἤρά γε τὸ προβεβουλευμένον; Dr. Elmsley was of opinion that the particle γε was inadmissible in an interrogative

¹ Above 1. 2. 6. for διατάσσει read διατάττει. Compare προστάττω and ταρτάττω, III. 8. 5. συντάττω, Polit. p. 426 E. ἐπιτάττω, ib. p. 382 A. p. 412 D, &c. In Rhet. II. 21. 2. ἀρῶσιν should be changed into πρέττειν.

sentence : see his note *ad Med.* 1331. The following examples, however, which we have collected from a few pages of the Great Ethics, and which might doubtless be much increased, seem sufficiently numerous to defend one another : p. 7. 8. οὐ δὴ ἴσως γε οὕτω σκεπτέον τὸ βέλτιστον· ἀλλ' ἄρα γε οὕτως, οἷον χωρὶς αὐτοῦ; ἢ καὶ τοῦτο ἄτοπον; p. 18. 5. ἀλλ' ἄρα γε βούλησις; p. 18. 24. ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡ προαίρεσις οὐδὲν τούτων ἐστίν, ἄρα γέ ἐστι τὸ κατὰ διάνοιαν ἐν προαιρέσει; p. 34. 24. ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐνταῦθα πάλιν ἀπορήσειεν ἂν τις, ἄρα γε ἐνδέχεται αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ἀδικεῖν; and see p. 7. 13. p. 46. 24. p. 61. 11. p. 64. 14. p. 73. 19. In 1. 5. 12. however, Mr. Cardwell prints ἀλλ' ἄρα γε τῇ ἀφ' ἐνὸς εἶναι ἢ πρὸς ἐν ἅπαντα συντελεῖν; But 1. 9. 2. ἄρα γε καὶ ἐστὶν εὐδαίμων, &c. This use of γε after the interrogative ἄρα seems to belong to the later Attic language : ' at least, we do not observe it so placed in any one of the numerous instances of ἄρα collected by Mr. Hermann in his Preface to the *Œdipus Coloneus*.

III. 5. 21. καὶ οὕτως ὡς ἂν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος προστάξῃ. IV. 5. 3. ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν ὁ λόγος τάξῃ. Read προστάξειεν or ποσσταίξει, and similarly in the other passage. Compare II. 6. 5. ἐστὶν ἄρα ἡ ἀρετὴ ἕξις προαιρετικὴ ἐν μεσότητι οὕσα τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ὠρισμένη λόγῳ, καὶ ὡς ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὀρίσειεν. Hermann *De Particula ἂν*, III. 11. *Classical Journal*, No. LXXII, p. 212, says, "*Ad hoc genus constructionis pertinent etiam particulae ὡς et ὅπως, quomodo significantes, quae sepiissime cum optativo et ἂν conjunguntur. Nam etiam sine illis particulis oratio optativum et ἂν habitura esset.*" And he quotes, among other passages, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 4. 28. μισθοφόρους ἐκπεπονημένους ὡς ἂν κράτιστοι εἶεν. See also Matthiæ *Greek Gr.* §. 519. third paragraph.

III. 6. 10. ὑπόγνια. The right form of this word is, we believe, ὑπόγνος, which has been properly restored by the learned editor of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, published at Oxford, in 1. 1. 7. II. 22. 11. (ed. 2.), and is printed in the *Politics*, p. 421 E. It is also in the best Ms. of that treatise hitherto collated : see Goettling's edition, p. 420.

III. 8. 2. The old reading *Διομήδη* should, we think, be retained (compare *Πολυνείκη*, *Rhet.* 1. 13. 2. *Σωκράτη*, *ib.* II. 23. 12. *Εὐθυκράτη*, *Polit.* p. 390 E. &c.); and in §. 6. *συνεοράκασιν* is more correct than *συνεωράκασιν*. Alexis, who was contemporary with Aristotle (*Clinton F. H. ad. ann.* 356, 306.) says, καὶ μὴν ἐνύπνιον οἶομαι γ' ἐορακέναί | νικητικόν, *Athen.* 1. p. 49 E. . . ἐοράκας πόπορ' ἐσκενασμένον | ἥνυστρον, &c. *ib.* F. See *Edinburgh Review*, vol. iii. p. 188.

III. 8. 6. δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναι πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου, ἃ μάλιστα συν-

¹ Thus in a conversation of Diogenes and Aristippus, reported by Athenæus XIII. p. 588 F. the latter philosopher says, ἄρα γε μή τί σοι ἄτοπον δοκεῖ εἶναι, Διόγηνει, οἰκίαν οἰκίῳ, &c. See, however, *Aristoph.* *Av.* 1213.

εωράκασιν οὔτοι. Mr. Cardwell has restored *καινὰ* for *κενὰ*, which had been introduced by Sylburg on conjecture. One of Wilkinson's manuscripts, however, has *κενὰ* on the margin, and a Paris

Ms. reads *κενὰ* (thus). This phrase frequently occurs in ancient writers, as Zell has remarked in his note, who quotes from Tacitus, Hist. ii. 69. *Ingens numerus inter inania belli adsumtus*. There is the same fluctuation in the manuscripts of Diodorus xxi. 2, where the fragment in Wesseling's edition reads *κενὰ*, and the new Ms. published by Mai *καινὰ* (see Dindorf's edition of the Vatican fragments of Diodorus, p. 48. 1.). Here the former word has been properly restored by Dindorf. Mai remarks a similar variation in Diod. xvii. 86. and observes, *Eadem lectio similiter sollicita fuit apud Polybium xxix. 6. vel potius apud Suidam in πολλὰ κενὰ, observante in scholiis Kustero; itemque apud Schotti proverbialia, cujus postremum certe exemplum metricum non sinit nos ambigere de lectione κενὰ*. In the notes of Henry Stephens and Wesseling on Diodorus xvii. 86. the reader will find all the information he can desire on this saying. We will put down a few of the passages collected by these and other critics. Diogenianus vii. 80. (quoted by Wesseling): *Πολλὰ κενὰ τοῦ πολέμου. ἦτοι διὰ τὸ πολλὰ καθ' ὑπόνοιαν φέρειν. ἢ ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι κεναῖς σφενδόνας καὶ νευραῖς ἐψόφουν πρὸς ἐκπληξιν τῶν πολεμίων*. The last of these two interpretations is perfectly absurd, but shows that the proverb was sometimes read *κενὰ τοῦ πολ.* The other explains *καινὰ τοῦ π.* as may be seen by a comparison of Vat. Append. iii. 62. *πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου. διὰ τὸ πολλὰ καθ' ὑπόνοιαν ἐκφοβεῖν*. We would in both glosses read *πρὸς ὑπόνοιαν ἐκφοβεῖν*. In the note of Schottus p. 515. two passages are quoted, which seem quite decisive. Quintus Curtius vii. 12. 25. *Ea res, sicut plerique belli vana et inania, barbaros ad deditionem traxit*. Plutarch de audicione, vol. vi. p. 148. ed. Reisk. *ὡς γὰρ πολέμου καὶ ἀκρόσεως πολλὰ κενὰ ἐστίν*. But the metrical proverb (v. 253.) on which Mai relies is of no authority, as it belongs to a collection made and versified by Joseph Scaliger. The Mss. are of no weight in such a case as this; and *κενὰ* should be received without hesitation. Perhaps Mr. Cardwell relied on the expression *τὸ καινὸν τοῦ πολέμου* in Thucydides iii. 30; which however signifies a *stratagem*, a *ruse de guerre*. Whereas in the passage before us the sense is: "There are many false *alarms* in war; many things where there is an *outward* show of danger, which is in fact *empty* or *hollow*; and this experienced soldiers generally see through (*συνεωράκασιν*)."

Compare Topic. viii. 12. 2.
 III. 8. 12. καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι δὴ ὀργιζόμενοι, &c. There seems to be no inference here from any preceding proposition; we would therefore read καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι δὲ ὀργ.

III. 8. 16. εἰάν γινώσκιν ὅτι ἔγερται ἢ ὑποπτεύουσιν, φεύγουσιν.
 III. 12. 7. καὶ μεγάλα καὶ σφαιραῖα ὅσα καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν ἐκκρού-

οῦσι. Read ὑποπτεύωσι and ἐκκρούωσιν. See our remarks below on IX. 7. 2. In the second only of these passages Mr. Cardwell passed by, but in the first he introduced, the indicative mood, the old reading being ὑποπτεύσωσι. He has nevertheless corrected a similar mistake in IX. 5. 3. ὅταν ποθῇ καὶ ἐπιθυμῇ. But he does not mention there that both the Basle and Sylburg's editions have ἐπιθυμῇ; and therefore we cannot tell whether the change was made on conjecture, or on the authority of his Ms. We have not examined the Aldine edition for that passage.

III. 10. 2. Mr. Cardwell has restored φιλομάθια for φιλομάθεια, from the Flor. Ms.; but it should be written φιλομαθία, the last syllable being long, as in ἀμαθία, πολυμαθία, χρηστομαθία, &c.

III. 10. 10. Διὸ καὶ ἤψατό τις [Φιλόξενος ὁ Ἐρύξειος] ὕψοφάγος ὦν. The words in brackets are omitted in the Aldine edition, and, as it appears, in some manuscripts. We think them spurious; for we cannot believe that Aristotle, with his love of brevity, would have said, *a certain Philoxenus the son of Eryxis*. No interpolations are so common as those of proper names. See Elmsley ad Iph. T. 824. Mus. Crit. vol. ii. p. 246. et ad Bacch. 1153. The verses of Macho (quoted by the commentators) also show that the voracity and prayer of this glutton were facts of general notoriety. Φιλόξενός ποθ', ὡς λέγουσ', ὁ Κυθήριος Ἡῤατο τριῶν ἔχειν λάρυγγα πήχεων, &c. Athen. p. 341 D.

III. 11. 3. τὸ γὰρ ἐσθίειν ἢ τυχόντα ἢ πίνειν ἕως ἂν πλησθῇ ὑπερβολή ἐστι τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τῷ πλήθει. The sense seems to require τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν. Ὑπερβολή is restored from the Flor. Ms. for the old reading ὑπερβάλλειν.

IV. 1. 15. Οὐδὲ λήψεται δὲ ἔθεν μὴ δεῖ· οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ τιμῶντος ἡ τοιαύτη λῆψις. Thus Mr. Cardwell, from the Flor. Ms. The common reading is οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ μὴ τιμῶντος τὰ χρήματα ἡ τοιαύτη λῆψις. This certainly gives the sense required, and there is no objection to the expression τιμῶν τὰ χρήματα, as it is used twice in this very chapter, § 20 and 26. At any rate it is necessary to read τοῦ μὴ τιμῶντος.

IV. 1. 27. ἀνάλωσεν. The Flor. Ms. has ἠνάλωσε. Read ἀνήλωσεν, and see Elmsley ad Soph. Aj. 1049. Mus. Crit. vol. i. p. 368. Hermann ad Aj. 1028.

IV. 2. 14. I. 11. 4. IX. 2. 5. X. 9. 8, 14. Mr. Cardwell writes προῦπαρχῇ as a trisyllable. We doubt the correctness of the change; 1. because we do not remember to have seen this crasis any where in metrical writings; and, 2. because we believe that the ancient Greeks sounded the aspirate in the middle as well as beginning of words; and therefore would have pronounced this προῦπαρχή. If this preposition had been ὑπό, and not ὑπό, we have no doubt that the Greeks would as willingly have said προῦπαρχω as προῦφείλω or προῦπεμπεν; but until Mr. Cardwell can bring some metrical authority, we shall continue to think that προῦπαρχῇ is a quadrisyllable.

IV. 2. 20. Μεγαρεῖς. The Flor. Ms. reads Μεγαροί, which is, we conceive, a remnant of the Attic form Μεγαρήs. Οι and η are frequently confounded in manuscripts.¹

IV. 3. 28. καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν φανερώs· παρρησιαστικός γάρ, διὰ τὸ καταφρονητικός εἶναι· καὶ παρρησιαστικός δέ· διὸ καταφρονητικός καὶ ἀλθθεντικός, πλὴν ὅσα μὴ δι' εἰρώνειαν. This is the text which Mr. Cardwell has compounded from the different versions of this passage; but we cannot believe that the writer who reduced logic to a system would have first inferred that a man was free-spoken because he despised the world, and then that he despised the world because he was free-spoken. We propose, with great doubt, παρρησιαστήs γάρ διὸ τὸ καταφρονητικός εἶναι· καὶ ἀλθθεντικός, πλὴν ὅσα, &c. Παρρησιαστήs is the reading of two of Wilkinson's Mss. and seems preferable.

IV. 1. 6. ἀντικείμεθα δὲ ἐνταῦθα οἱ ἄκροι φαίνονται. Perhaps ἀντικείμεθα δὴ ἐνταῦθα, &c.

IV. 5. 10. ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ πέψαι τὴν ὀργὴν χρόνου δεῖ. We would read ἐν αὐτῷ.

IV. 7. 9. ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἀλθθοῦs ἀποκλίνει. The future, ἀποκλινεῖ, seems preferable.

IV. 8. 10. καὶ ταῦτα λέγων ὧν οὐδὲν εἶποι ἂν ὁ χαρίεις εἶποι. Thus the Florence Ms., and thus Mr. Cardwell. In the editions the first εἶποι is omitted. We conceive that this variety only authorises the editor to choose between ὧν οὐδὲν ἂν ὁ χαρίεις εἶποι and ὧν οὐδὲν εἶποι ἂν ὁ χαρίεις. The repetition of the verb seems to us to make the construction very harsh, if not ungrammatical.

V. 1. 6. ἀκολουθεῖ δ' ὡs ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἂν θάτερα πλεοναχῶs λέγεται καὶ θάτερα πλεοναχῶs λέγεσθαι· οἷον εἰ τὸ ἀδικον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία. This is the reading of the new Ms., which Mr. Cardwell has admitted into the text; the editions have οἷον εἰ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἀδικον. Zell says (p. 163.), "οἷον τὸ δίκαιον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία in *Eudemis*; *rectius*. Nam ex nostri loci *scriptione paulo prius pro θάτερα accuratissimus auctor potius scripsisset τὰ ἐναντία.*" Now this is the very thing of which we are not certain; and we conceive that if Aristotle had only intended to argue from the word *unjust* to the words *injustice, unjustly, &c.*, he would have used the term *σύστοιχος* or *σύμπτωσις*.² Indeed, θάτερον appears to be the proper

¹ *Facilius permutantur ὅποι et ὅπη quam ὅπου et ὅπη, propterea quod diphthongus οι et vocalis η eodem sono a recentioribus Græcis offeruntur.* Elmsley ad Eurip. Heraclid. 19.

² Topic. II. 9. 1. λέγεται δὲ σύστοιχα μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα, οἷον τὰ δίκαια καὶ ὁ ἀδικος τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Mr. Cardwell supposes the remark in the Ethics to be a particular case of the general rule laid down in the Topics, δηλονότι ὅτι ὁποιονοῦν δε χθίντος τῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν συστοιχίαν, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα δεδειγμένα ἴσται, *ibid.* If this had been so, we do not see any reason why Aristotle should have restricted himself in the Ethics, and said, ἀκολουθεῖ ὡs ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ.

term for contraries, as any person may convince himself by looking at the section on opposites in the Categories, and in which we do not refer to any particular passage, since the word is so frequently there made use of (p. 47--53. ed. Sylburg.). We believe that *θάτερον*—*θάτερον* in Greek exactly correspond to “the one” and “the other” in English. Now these expressions are never used except when *two* definite things are signified, such for instance as contraries; or, if only two cases were possible, we should say, “if it is not the one, it must be *the* other.” Thus Aristotle *Topic. vi. 13. 2.* δύο γὰρ ὄντων εἰ ἐκάτερος θάτερον, ἔχει, &c. We will, for the sake of illustration, set down two out of the numerous examples which occur in that same treatise: *II. 6. 1.* ὅσους δὲ ἀνάγκη θάτερον μόνον ὑπάρχειν, οἷον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν νόσον ἢ τὴν υἰείαν, ἐὰν πρὸς θάτερον εὐπορῶμεν διαλέγεσθαι ὅτι ὑπάρχει ἢ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν εὐπαρήσομεν. τὸ λοιπὸν, the remaining one. *VII. 1. 5.* καθόλου δ' εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τῶν ὑπωσούν ἐκατέρου κατηγορουμένων σκοπεῖν εἰ πον διαφωρεῖ· ὅσα γὰρ θιτέρου κατηγορεῖται καὶ θατέρου κατηγορεῖται. If Aristotle had intended merely to argue from one conjugate to another, we conceive that he would have used some such words as the following, ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ ἀπλῶς ἐὰν τῶν συστυίχων ἓν ὑπωσούν πλεοναχῶς λέγεται, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πλεοναχῶς λέγεσθαι, οἷον εἰ τὸ ἄδικον, καὶ ἡ ἀδικία. Compare *Topic. vii. 2. 10.* ἕνος οὖν ὑπωσούν τῶν εἰρημένων (συστοιχείᾳ) ὁμολογηθέντος, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὁμολογεῖσθαι, and nearly the same words again in the same section.¹ The reading in the Eudemian Ethics is not however as Zell represents it (at least not in the Basle edition of 1550, nor in Sylburg's, p. 129. 2.), but as in the Florence Ms., οἷον εἰ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία. The old text certainly agrees better both with the succeeding and preceding arguments; perhaps, however, we might read, οἷον εἰ τὸ δίκαιον, καὶ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία.

V. 1. 15. ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἔνι. Thus the Flor. Ms. The Paris Ms., in Zell's edition, has ἀρετὴ ἔνι. It is very probable that Aristotle misquoted the line from memory: but that he *did* misquote it, we have no doubt; as ἀρετὴ ἔστιν, which is in all the numerous manuscripts of Theognis, is evidently the right reading. Of the words οὐθ' ἔσπερος οὐθ' ἑφῶς οὕτω θαυμαστός, Zell remarks, *Senarius est proverbialis, ut videtur.* He seems to be serious, and therefore we suppose he scans his verse thus, οὐθ' ἔσ[περος] οὐθ' | ἑφ[ῶς] οὕτω θαυ[μαστός].

V. 4. 12. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν ἀνηροῦντο γὰρ ἂν εἰ μὴ ἐποίει τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ ὅσον καὶ οἷον, καὶ τὸ πάσχειν ἐπύσχε τοῦτο καὶ τοσοῦτον καὶ τοιοῦτον. This sentence occurs in so many

¹ The following rule from the Topics is perhaps more to the point: ἐπὶ τῶν πολλῶν τεχνῶν καὶ γὰρ αὖ, θάτερον ἀντιθέσθαι τῶν πλεοναχῶν καὶ μενέων, καὶ μὴ ἀμεβεῖν ἀντέχουσαι. *Topics. vi. 13. 2.*

words in the next chapter (§ 9.), where it is in its place; and we think Mr. Cardwell would have done well if he had followed the example of former editors, and marked it as spurious on this its first appearance.

v. 5. 12. *eis σχῆμα δ' οὐ δεῖ ἄγειν ἀναλογίας*. The negative particle here makes the sense directly the reverse of that which is required; but whether it is the corruption of some other word, or whether it is a mere interpolation, we do not pretend to decide. Zell, indeed, says: *Negatio οὐ, ut ego sentio, aut stabit aut ejicienda erit, prout analogiam intellexeris: si geometricam, stabit; sin autem arithmetica, ejicietur*. But Aristotle has, in all this part, been speaking of the common geometrical proportion; the arithmetical proportion or progression referred to quite a different subject.

v. 5. 13. *ὅτι δ' ἡ χρεία ἀνέχει ὥσπερ ἐν τι ὃν δηλοῖ ὅτι, ὅταν μὴ ἐν χρείᾳ ὦσιν ἀλλήλων ἢ ἀμφοτέροι ἢ ἄτερος, οὐκ ἀλλάττονται, ὥσπερ, ὅταν οὐ ἔχει αὐτὸς δέηταί τις, οἷον οἴνου, δόντες σίτου ἐξαγωγῆς*. The last part is thus given from the Flor. Ms., the old reading being *διδόντες σίτου ἐξαγωγὴν*. The sense appears to be this: *And that demand is the thing which really binds people together is evident from this, that if they have no need of one another's goods, either one or both of them, no exchange takes place; as when persons want that commodity which you possess, as wine for example, they give it in exchange for exported corn*. But we confess that even this improved version of the text is to us very unsatisfactory, if at least we have rendered the passage correctly; for instead of *give*, the sense requires *get* or *obtain*. If *διδόντες σίτου ἐξαγωγὴν* will mean *giving in exchange exported corn*, the old reading seems preferable to the new. But, with our present lights, we fear that this passage is incurably corrupt or mutilated; and we can only hope that Mr. Cardwell may throw some light on it in his second volume.

v. 7. 1. *νομιμόν*. So the Florence Ms., the editions have *νομικόν*. As however the Ms. has the accent of *νομικόν* (which, by the way, Mr. Cardwell has forgotten to correct), and the transcriber might have remembered the word *νόμιμος*, which occurs so frequently in the preceding chapters, we should be inclined to keep the old reading, particularly as *νομικὸς* is undoubtedly an Aristotelian word (*Polit.* p. 228 C. *νῦν δὲ νομικῶς διέλωμεν*). In v. 9. 12, where the expression *νομικόν δίκαιον* occurs twice, no variety is noted from the Ms., nor does Mr. Cardwell alter the text: and it is twice again used in VIII. 13. 5, 6.

v. 7. 2. *καίει*. We have no doubt that *κάω* was the common Attic form in Aristotle's time.

v. 9. 1. Two lines of Euripides are quoted,
μητέρα κατέκτα τὴν ἐμήν· βραχὺς λόγος,
ἐκὼν ἐκούσαν ἢ θέλουσαν οὐχ ἐκὼν.

We very much prefer βραχὺς ὁ λόγος, the reading of the Basle edition.

v. 9. 15. Mr. Cardwell writes ἐλέβορον for ἐλλέβορον from the Florence Ms. We doubt whether correctly. The metre requires ἐλλέβορον in Aristoph. Vesp. 1489.; and that the Latins made the first syllable long, we know from Virgil's Georgics. This word also occurs in Mag. Mor. II. 3. p. 43. 2. where we should like to know the reading of the Ms.

v. 10. 5. ὁ κἄν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτὸς ἂν εἴποι ἐκεῖ παρῶν, καὶ εἰ ᾗδει ἐνομοθέτησεν ἂν. The Florence Ms. has ὁ κἄν νομοθέτης αὐτὸς εἶπε παρῶν καὶ εἰ ᾗδῃ ἐνομοθέτησε. We do not think this too concise for Aristotle, and would read, ὁ κἄν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτὸς εἶπε παρῶν, καὶ εἰ ᾗδει ἐνομοθέτησεν. Our reason for preferring this is, that we do not remember to have met with the double ἂν in Aristotle.¹

v. 11. 1. οὐ κελεύει ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτενεῖν ὁ νόμος. The Florence Ms. has ἀποκτινύναι ἑαυτὸν, which Mr. Cardwell has received into the text.

v. 11. 4. Ἐτι καθ' ὃ ἄδικος ὁ μόνον ἀδικῶν καὶ μὴ ἀπλῶς φαῦλος, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικῆσαι ἑαυτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἄλλο ἐκείνου· ἔστι γὰρ πῶς ὁ ἄδικος οὕτω πονηρὸς ὥσπερ ὁ δειλὸς, οὐχ ὡς ὕλην ἔχων τὴν πονηρίαν· ὥστ' οὐδὲ κατὰ ταύτην ἀδικεῖ· ἅμα γὰρ ἂν τῷ αὐτῷ εἶη ἀφηρησθαι καὶ προσκεῖσθαι τὸ αὐτό· τοῦτο δὲ ἀδύνατον· ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ἐν πλείοσιν ἀνάγκη εἶναι τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἄδικον. In the first place Dindorf ad Aristoph. Eq. 1046. rightly corrects μόνον ὁ ἀδικῶν. For the argument is this. *Since a man who does an injury² is merely an unjust man, and is not absolutely wicked, it is not possible to do an injustice to oneself. For general vice and the commission of an injury differ. Thus a coward is unjust, but he is not altogether wicked; and consequently, he does not do a wrong from general depravity. Indeed if he did, the same thing would be taken from and given to the same person at the same time; which is impossible: and therefore justice and injustice must always be concerned with more than one person.* In the next place, the Florence Ms. (which we have followed in the rest of this paragraph), has κατὰ ταύτην ἀδικεῖ ἂν, which Mr. Cardwell admits into the text. But we conceive that either it should be read ἀδικοῖ ἂν, or the particle must be omitted, as in

¹ ix. 11. 2. διὸ κἄν ἀπορήσειεν ἂν τις. The Florence Ms. rightly reads ἀπορήσειεν τις. Polit. p. 324 C. καὶ γὰρ ἂν οἱ χαρίεντες ἀγανακτοῖεν ἂν, ὡς οὐκ ἴστων ὄντες ἀξιοί: here Coray proposes to omit the second ἂν.

² It is a pity that the English word *wrong-doer*, which exactly corresponds to ὁ ἀδικῶν, should have become obsolete, except in our legal language. The term *malefactor* has by custom obtained a limited and secondary meaning, being used to signify a *criminal* offender, and generally (if we mistake not) a *convicted* criminal offender.

the common editions. Mr. Cardwell has restored ἀγνοῖ for ἀγνοεῖ in VI. 7. 7. and σπουδάξοι for σπουδάξει in IX. 8. 5.

VI. 1. 1. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τυγχάνομεν πρότερον εἰρηκότες ὅτι δεῖ τὸ μέσον αἰρεῖσθαι, μήτε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν μηδὲ τὴν ἔλλειψιν, τὸ δὲ μέσον ἐστίν, &c. Mr. Cardwell has properly received μὴ for μήτε from his manuscript. See Elmsley ad Med. 4. et Œd. T. 817. ed. 2. (with Hermann's answer Opusc. vol. III. p. 150. cf. ad Œd. Col. 423). Above IV. 3. 31. οὔτε γὰρ ἵνα ἐπαινῇται μέλει αὐτῷ, οὐδ' ὅπως οἱ ἄλλοι ψέγωνται. Read οὐδὲ γάρ. There is the same mistake in the Florence Ms. in v. 1. 4. In IV. 1. 16. οὐκ ἂν εἴη οὐτ' αἰτητικὸς, the editor has restored οὐδ' αἰτητικὸς from the same Ms. There is a very difficult passage in the Politics, where μηδὲ seems to follow μήτε. It is thus written in Sylburg's edition, p. 334 C. Καὶ βέλτιον δὲ τοὺς βασιλεῖς, μήτε κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι γένος, μηδὲ τοῦτο τὸ τυχόν, εἴτε διαφέρων ἐκ τούτων αἰρετοὺς μᾶλλον ἢ καθ' ἡλικίαν. For εἴτε we would write εἴ τέ τι, and arrange the sentence as follows: Καὶ βέλτιον δὲ τοὺς βασιλεῖς μήτε κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι γένος (μηδὲ τοῦτο τὸ τυχόν), εἴ τέ τι διαφέρων ἐκ τούτων, &c. Aristotle is describing the comparative merits of the Lacedæmonian and Carthaginian governments, and he says: *Another superiority which belongs to the Carthaginian constitution is, that the kings are not always taken from the same family (though they are not chosen at random from any families); and from these they are selected rather according to merit than age.* Ibid. p. 370 E. ὥστε πολλάκις οὐ κοινωνοῦσι τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὔτε τοῦ δικάζειν. Perhaps this should not be altered.¹ But, to return to the point from which we started, we rather think that the words μὴ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν μηδὲ τὴν ἔλλειψιν *glossam redolent*, as the phrase is.

VI. 1. 2. Mr. Cardwell is not quite regular in noting the various readings. Thus he mentions that *for τοῦτ' ἀληθές, his three editions have τοῦτο ἀληθές; and in the same section he does not mention that Sylburg's and the Basle editions have τοῦτ' εἰρημένον for τοῦτο εἰρημένον. If this variety was worth remarking in one place, it was in both.

VI. 2. 3. ἡ ἀλήθεια. Mr. Cardwell writes ἀλήθεια simply, from the Florence Ms. We are in doubt whether that reading does not mean ἀλήθεια; but as the predicate of the corresponding part of the sentence has not the article, viz. τᾷ ἀληθείς ἐστι καὶ ψεῦδος, where τᾷ ἀληθές is equivalent to ἀλήθεια, perhaps the new text is correct.

VI. 3. 2. τὰ δ' αἰδία ἀγέννητα καὶ ἄφθορα. Read ἀγέννητα, as in

¹ Polit. p. 362 A. οὔτε γὰρ κτείνειν ἢ φυγαδεύειν οὐδ' ὀστρακίζειν δὴ πού τὸν τοιοῦτον πρέπειν ἐστίν, οὐτ' ἀξιοῦν ἀρχεσθαι ἀνὰ μέρος. Here the οὐδὲ depends on ἢ not on οὔτε, and is not to be altered. 'It is neither fit to put to death or banish, nor *not even* to ostracize such a man as this, nor to require of him,' &c. Compare Eth. Nic. x. 9. 18. οὔτε [γὰρ] γράφοντες οὔτε λίσσαντες περὶ τῶν τοιούτων φαίνομεθα, οὐδ' αὖ πολιτικούς θεποιοῦντες τοὺς σφετέρους νόμους.

the verses of Agathon quoted in the last chapter. Philemon fragm. incert. 39. ed. Meineke. φύσει γὰρ οὐδεὶς δούλος ἐγενήθη ποτέ. Where Meineke says, *Insolens apud Atticos aoristi forma ἐγενήθη, cujus haud antiquius Machone exemplum eruit Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 109.* Agathon, however, was an author of the most approved age, being a cotemporary of Aristophanes and Euripides.

VI. 4. 6. This sentence is not stopped so as to make it clear that the words *περὶ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἄλλως ἔχειν* refer both to *τέχνη* and *ἀτεχνία*?

VI. 5. 3. τῶν μὴ ἐνδεχομένων αὐτῷ πρᾶξαι. Should not this be αὐτῷ?

VI. 7. 2. ὥσπερ Ὁμηρὸς φησιν ἐν τῷ *Μαργείτῃ*. We believe this to be as great and as recent a barbarism as *πολείτης, τεχνείτης, Διεὶ*, &c. for *πολίτης, τεχνίτης, Διί*. In the *Poetics* § 7, 8. the Paris Ms. 2038. (which seems to be the best hitherto collated) has twice *Μαργίτης*. The same form is likewise preserved in the passages of Plato (where also the Mss. differ), Dio Chrysostom, Suidas, Hephæstion, and the Scholiast to Aristophanes quoted by Tyrwhitt in his note. In the *Eudemean Ethics*, v. 7. p. 154. 14. it is read *Μαργείτης*.¹

Ibid. In this sentence we think that the words from *οὐ κατὰ μέρος* down to *σοφόν*, should be included in a parenthesis.

VI. 7. 4. εἰ δὴ ὑγιεινὸν μὲν καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἕτερον ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἰχθύσι, τὸ δὲ λευκὸν καὶ εὐθὺ τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ, καὶ τὸ σοφὸν ταὐτὸ πάντες ἂν εἴποιεν, φρόνιμον δὲ ἕτερον (τὸ γὰρ περὶ αὐτὸ ἕκαστα εἶ θεωροῦν φατέον ἂν εἶναι φρόνιμον καὶ τούτῳ ἐπιτρέψειαν αὐτὰ διὸ καὶ τῶν θηρίων ἕνια φρόνιμά φασιν εἶναι ὅσα περὶ τὸν αὐτῶν βίον ἔχοντα φαινεταὶ δύναμιν προνοητικὴν), φανερόν δ' ὅτι οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ ἡ αὐτή. This is the manner in which we conceive that the above passage should be arranged. The Florence Ms. has *φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι*, which Mr. Cardwell has admitted into the text.

¹ The grammarians state that all words in *-της* are written with *ι* only, except *ἐλπίτης, Ἀταρείτης, Ζηλείτης, Σαρμαρείτης* and *ᾠρίτης* (Theodosius de Gramm. p. 66. and Chieroboscus cited by Goettling p. 228.) These, however, are regularly formed from *ἔλος (-ιος), Ἀταρινός* (see Steph. Byz. in *Φιλλεύς*), *Ζέλεα, Σαρμαρείαι*, and *ᾠρεός*, as is very clearly explained by Stephanus of Byzantium in *Βορυσθίνης* and *ᾠρεός*, who adds some other instances. This silence of the grammarians, who were generally well acquainted with the writings (real or supposed) of Homer, seems to be as conclusive as is possible for a negative proof. Again, in all the exceptions quoted, it is clear that the *ι* belongs to the original word, not to the termination. Now it will hardly be denied, that the name of Margites, who "knew many things, and knew them all ill," and "who was neither made for a ditcher, nor a ploughman, nor any other trade," was derived from *μάργος*, a word of unquestionable antiquity, being used in the *Odyssey*, and a fragment of the *Ἡοίαι* (Athen. p. 423 C.) If so, as *ᾠρί-ος* made *ᾠρε-ίτης*, so *μάργ-ος* made *μαργ-ίτης*.

We do not however see what, according to his punctuation, is the apodosis to εἰ δὴ. If, indeed, that reading is adopted, it might be rendered "If the objects of science and prudence are different (τὸ σοφὸν καὶ τὸ φρόνιμον), it is then plain also that science and moral philosophy will themselves not be the same." Aristotle, it is true, occasionally forgets himself, and, instead of giving the apodosis, changes the construction of the sentence; but it does not seem necessary on the present occasion to accuse him of this negligence. Thus v. 6. 6. there is nothing to answer to ἐπεὶ δ' οὐδέν, &c. for he alters the construction and subjoins μισθὸς ὅστις τις δοτέος. There is also, in a passage of the *Politics*, a construction somewhat similar; and we will transcribe it in order to show that, though it is carelessly written, it is in fact grammatical. P. 419 B. 'Ἐπεὶ δ' αἱ τελευταῖαι δημοκραταὶ πολυάνθρωποι τέ εἰσι, καὶ χαλεπὸν ἐκκλησιάζειν ἀμισθοῦς, τούτῳ δ' ὅπου πρόσδοι μὴ τυγχάνουσιν οὐσαι πόλεμιον τοῖς γνωρίμοις (ἀπὸ τοῦ γὰρ εἰσφορᾶς καὶ δημεύσεως ἀναγκαῖον γίνεσθαι καὶ δικαστηρίων φαύλων), ὅπου μὲν οὖν πρόσδοι μὴ τυγχάνουσιν οὐσαι δεῖ ποιεῖν ὀλίγας ἐκκλησίας, &c. Here μὲν οὖν serves to recall the reader's attention to the clause which preceded the parenthesis "when, I say, there are not sufficient regular revenues," &c. See Zell ad Eth. VII. 14. 3.

VI. 9. 4. Euripides: πῶς δ' ἂν φρονοῖν ᾧ παρὴν ἀπραγμόνως ἔν τοῖσι πολλοῖς ἡριθιμμένον στρατοῦ ἴσον μετασχεῖν. No variety in the two first lines is noted by Mr. Cardwell. The Basle edition, however, has ἡριθμημένῳ; and Sylburg's, which has the accusative case here, has the dative in Eth. Eudem. p. 156. 7. where the same verses are cited. We have, however, no doubt that Mr. Cardwell's choice is correct; nor should we have noticed the variety, had he not in his preface stated that *all* the different readings were put at the bottom of the page; which does not seem to have been his intention.

VII. 2. 1. δεινὸν γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ἐρούσης, ὥς ᾤετο Σωκράτης, ἄλλο τι κρατεῖν καὶ περιέλκειν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἀνδρίαποδον. Mr. Cardwell restores αὐτὴν from his manuscript. Compare below 3. 13, 14. καὶ εὐκειν ὃ ἐξήτει ὁ Σωκράτης συμβαίνειν· οὐ γὰρ τῆς κυρίως εἶναι δοκούσης ἐπιστήμης παρούσης γίνεται τὸ πάθος, οὐδὲ αὐτὴ περιέλεται διὰ τὸ πάθος.

VII. 6. 3. We would read this passage thus: καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν κεστὸν ἱμᾶντα

πάρφρασις ἢ ἔκλεψε νόον, &c.

¹ Goettling ad Aristot. Polit. p. 291. says, 'Δὲ in apodosis admodum est familiare Aristoteli. Sic v. c. VIII. 7. init. ἐπεὶ δὲ—ἀποδοκιμάζομεν—σκηπτίον δὲ, &c. Cf. Zellium ad Eth. Nicom. p. 5. Wolf. ad Lept. p. 297." And in the Addenda he adds, "Δὲ in apodosis post ἐπεὶ Homericum est, Odyss. XXI. 273, 274. οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν σπείσαν τ' ἐπιόν θ' ὅσον ἤθιλε θυμὸς, τοῖς δὲ δολαφρονίων μετῆρη, πολὺμητις Ὀδυσσεύς." See also Elmsley ad Bacch. 180.

i. e. and as Homer says of the girdle of Venus, *πάρφασις*, &c. φησι being understood from the preceding *φασί*. This arrangement is confirmed by some manuscripts and editions,¹ which read *καὶ τὸν κεστὸν ἱμᾶντα* "Ομηρος.

VII. 7. 1. *μεταξὺ δὲ τῶν πλείστων ἔξεις, κἂν εἰ ῥέπωσι μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰς χεῖρους*. Here *κἂν* is for *καὶ ἔαν*, i. e. *καὶ εἰ ἂν*: read therefore *κἂν ῥέπωσι*. Viger viii. 7. 13. quotes the following passage of Aristotle: *οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες, κἂν εἰ μείζους κἂν ἐλάττους φαίνονται*; on which Hermann observes (No. 327), *Aristoteles scripserit necesse est κἂν μείζους, omisso εἰ*. Aristot. Topic. v. 6. 8. *κἂν εἰ τοῦ μὴ ἀνθρώπου φαίνεται ἴδιον τὸ μὴ ζῶον*. ib. 9. *κἂν εἰ δὲ τοῦ ζῶου φαίνεται ἴδιον τὸ ζῆν*. The *εἰ* should be expunged in both places. In § 10. the cod. Guelph. has by a contrary error *κἂν εἰ δὲ* for *εἰ δέ*. The examples quoted by Elmsley ad Med. 911. will not defend the use of *ἂν εἰ* for *εἰ ἂν* when no verb precedes.

VII. 7. 3. *διὸ ὁ ἀκόλαστος χεῖρων τοῦ ἀκρατοῦς*. Read *ὁ μαλακός*. Though this seems rather a violent alteration, no one can entertain a doubt of its correctness who will read the argument of which it is the last conclusion, and which from its length we forbear to transcribe. "*Of persons who indulge in bodily pleasures to excess there are,*" says Aristotle, "*two varieties, the incontinent (ἀκρατής), and the effeminate or non-enduring man (μαλακός); the first being led away by pleasure, the second only wishing to avoid pain. Now every one will acknowledge, that a man who commits a disgraceful action under the influence of strong passions is less blameworthy than one who has none or very slight desires; or a man who strikes you in a fit of anger, than one who does the same in cool blood. Consequently the effeminate man (who has no passions to excuse his faults) is more to be blamed than the incontinent man (who has).* διὸ ὁ μαλακός (not ὁ ἀκόλαστος) χεῖρων τοῦ ἀκρατοῦς. There is an argument to the same effect in the next paragraph, which ends διὸ αἰρετώτερον ἐγκράτεια καρτερίας ἐστίν. "Wherefore continence is better than endurance;" which in the last sentence was put in this form, "non-endurance is worse than incontinence."

VII. 10. 3. Anaxandrides' joke would, in our opinion, be very much improved by reading *ἡ πόλις ἐβούλεν*, with Lambinus, Muretus, and other commentators. A Paris Ms. also has *ἐβούλευσεν*, and a Breslau Ms. *ἐβουλεύετο*, which last reading, perhaps, shows the manner in which the present word came into the text.

VII. 11. 14. This admirable treatise on Pleasure is so strongly

¹ For instance Sylburg's and the Basle edition, which varieties Mr. Cardwell has omitted to notice. In the latter the sentence is stopped rightly, as we conceive. Below too, in § 6., the same editions have *ἀνθρωπικαὶ εἴσι*, which Mr. Cardwell has equally neglected.

marked with the peculiarities and powers of Aristotle's mind and style, that we cannot for a moment doubt its genuineness. But we have as little doubt that it was inserted in this place by the diligence of some disciple or *rédacteur*. For it evidently disturbs the order of the work, and the subject is fully discussed in its proper place in the last book. And that it is not very artificially inserted, may be seen from the last sentence in the 7th book: *περὶ μὲν οὖν ἐγκρατείας καὶ ἀκρασίας εἶρηται· λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ φιλίας ἐροῦμεν*. After which the next book begins thus: *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ φιλίας ἔποιτ' ἂν διελθεῖν*. This is to our mind a convincing proof of interpolation; for it should be remembered that, even if the division into books was made by Aristotle (which, to say the least, is very uncertain), there is always a close connexion between them. Thus the *δὲ* at the beginning of the 9th book answers to *μὲν οὖν* at the end of the 8th. See, however, our observations at the end of the 9th book.

VII. 13. 1. Aristotle having come to the conclusion that pleasure is a good, continues thus: *ὥς γὰρ Σπείσιππος ἔλυνεν, οὐ συμβαίνει ἢ λύσις· ὥσπερ τὸ μεῖζον τῷ ἑλάττω καὶ τῷ ἴσῳ ἐναντίον· οὐ γὰρ ἂν φαίη ὅπερ κακόν τι εἶναι τὴν ἡδονήν*. Speusippus's proof that pleasure is *not* a good is contained in the middle of these three clauses, and its import may be collected from a passage of Aulus Gellius cited by Victorius: *Speusippus voluptatem et dolorem duo mala esse dicit opposita inter se; bonum autem esse, quod utriusque medium foret*, viii. 7. The literal sense seems to be this: "As the greater is opposed to the less, so it is to the mean." Now though we are aware that it is exceedingly difficult to catch the precise force of the short hints which Aristotle gives of those doctrines of other philosophers, which were probably well known in his time; yet we cannot but think that this is the very reverse of the meaning required, and that we ought to read, *καὶ οὐ τῷ ἴσῳ ἐναντίον*.² "Pleasure and pain," said Speusippus, "are indeed opposed; but they are opposed not as contraries but as extremes, the excellence, viz. freedom from pain, lying in the mean." This we conceive is the very same argument which Aristotle refutes in another place, (x. 2. 5.) *οὐκ ἔοικε δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου καλῶς λέγεσ-*

¹ We have used the word *mean*, and not *equal*, for the sake of clearness, while it is indifferent for the sense; for Aristotle supposes four quantities, with one of which he compares an equal, a greater, and a less. See II. 8. 2.

² A Mr. C. J. Jacob, who has lately published an edition of Lucian's Alexander, gives a separate Excursus *De negatione οὐ tum male adjecta, tum male omitta*, (p. 137—142.) Among his instances is a passage of Diodorus, where Meineke reads *καὶ οὐ πολλὴν* for *καὶ πολλήν* (xii. 81. cf. Thuc. vi. 7.) In *Lysias* against Evandrus p. 430. Bekker has received *οὐ δυνατὸν* for *δυνατὸν* from one manuscript, Orat. Att. vol. i. See also our remarks above on iv. 1. 15. and v. 5. 12. and in the *Rhetoric* II. 7. 6. σημειῖν δὲ ἢ ἑλάττω μὴ ὑπερίττησαν, we would read ἢ ἑλάττω ὑπερίττησαν.

θαι. οὐ γάρ φασιν εἰ ἡ λύπη κακὸν ἐστὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι· ἀντικεισθαι γὰρ κακὸν κακῷ καὶ ἃ μῶ τῷ μηδετέρῳ. Andronicus avoids the difficulty by paraphrasing καθάπερ τὸ μείζον καὶ τὸ ἐλαττον ἐναντίον ἐστὶ τῷ ἴσῳ. Aristotle's remark (οὐ γὰρ ἂν, &c.) seems not to be directed against the *argument* of Speusippus, but against the *truth* of his conclusion. As to the words themselves, it seems to us that either ὑπερ κακὸν, or κακὸν τι, would be correct, but not both. We would therefore omit τι; as the scholiasts have done in their explanation of this passage.

VII. 13. 2. "Ἀρίστον δ' οὐδὲν κωλύει ἡδονὴν τινα εἶναι. *There is no reason why some pleasure should not be the summum bonum.* Compare above 11. 3. μὴ ἐνδέχασθαι εἶναι τὸ ἄριστον ἡδονὴν, below in the same section, ὥστε εἴη ἂν τις ἡδονὴ τὸ ἄριστον' and § 5. τὸ διώκειν δ' ἅπαντα τὴν ἡδονὴν σημειὸν τι τοῦ εἶναί πως τὸ ἄριστον αὐτήν. It seems, therefore, necessary to read τὸ δὲ ἄριστον οὐδὲν, &c. There is, we believe, the same difference between ἄριστον and τᾶριστον, as between ἀγαθὸν and τἀγαθόν. This, if it requires illustration, is well illustrated by a passage in the Eudemean Ethics I. 8. p. 85. Syll. σκεπτέον τοίνυν τί τὸ ἄριστον' ἐν τισὶ δὴ μάλιστα φαίνεται δόξαι εἶναι τοῦτο· φασὶ γὰρ ἄριστον εἶναι πάντων αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν.

VII. 13. 5. The following verse is quoted in the text: φήμη δ' οὐ τις πάντα ἀπόλλυται, ἢν τινα πολλοί. Mr. Cardwell states the various readings thus: φήμη δ' οὐ τί γε . . . λαοὶ πολλοὶ φημίζωσι S. C. οἱ πολλοὶ L. φημίζωσι I. We are quite unable to guess from this what is the reading of the manuscript. It may be observed that Aristotle omits the line which contains the point of the quotation: θεὸς νῦν τις ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτή.

VIII. 1. 5. "Not only," says Aristotle, "is friendship necessary, but it is also honorable, τοὺς γὰρ φιλοφίλους ἐπαινοῦμεν, for we praise people for being friendly." Mr. Cardwell reads from the Flor. Ms. τοὺς γὰρ φίλους ἐπαινοῦμεν, according to which the sense would be, "for we praise those who have been constant in their friendship," Achilles and Patroclus, for instance. VIII. 8. 4. μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς φιλίας οὐσης ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν, καὶ τῶν φιλοφίλων ἐπαινομένων, &c. Here, too, the Flor. Ms. reads καὶ τῶν φίλων, but Mr. Cardwell has very properly refused it a place in the text, as the sense requires φιλοφίλων. With this example before our eyes, we would leave φιλοφίλους in the former passage, where it certainly seems to agree best with the context.

VIII. 6. 2. πολλοὺς δ' ἅμα τῷ αὐτῷ σφόδρα ἀρέσκειν οὐ ῥᾶδιον, ἴσως δ' οὐδ' ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι. Aristotle is examining the question whether a person can have many real friends; and he says, according to the present text, "*It is not easy for many really to please the same man, nor perhaps is it easy for them to be good.*" Why there should not be several good men we have not an idea; nor does the remark appear to the purpose. How much more clear and

natural is the other reading, ἀγαθόν. "For many persons really to please the same way is not easy, and perhaps not even desirable." Comp. ix. 10. 2 sqq. • Why it is not a good to have many friends, he explains, Mag. Mor. II. 16.

VIII. 9. 5. We fear, that notwithstanding the assistance of the Flor. Ms., the last part of this chapter is still in a very dilapidated state. It does not appear that any transposition of sentences will remedy the misfortune; we think rather that some words have fallen out between βίον and θυσίας, and that βίον is the last word of the sentence, unless the sentence from αὐταὶ τὸ βίον is read in a parenthesis.

VIII. 13. 10. κατασμικρίζοντες. Thus the Florence Ms. The Aldine and Basle editions have κατασμικρίνοντες and κατασμικρύνοντες, which is the only form noticed in the lexicons. The reading of the Ms. is however confirmed by a passage in Philodemus περὶ κακιῶν, which we will transcribe for the convenience of the reader, as it also illustrates another part of these Ethics, viz. the character of the ἀλάζων in iv. 7. Philodemus having described a person who is affected in his dress, gait, &c. says, οὗς . . . βρενθυομένους ὠνόμαζον καὶ οὗς νῦν ὀνομάζουσιν, εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παραδεδωμένου θυμιάματος ἢ μύρου τῶν ἐκ τῆς βρένθυος ¹ (ὡς καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μίνθωνας ἀπὸ τῆς μίνθης), εἴτ' ἀφ' ὅτου δὴ ποτε, τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρημένης διαθέσεως κατεμβλέποντα καὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ κατασειόντα καὶ κατασμικρίζοντα (ita cod.) τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας ἢ οὗς ἂν τις μνημονεύσῃ, Herculanensia (Oxford, 1824.) vol. i. part 1. p. 22. ²

IX. 4. 1. τὰ φιλικὰ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς φίλους. The Flor. Ms. has πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πέλας. The same reading is in a manuscript compared by Wilkinson, who observes on it, *Forsan πρὸς τοὺς πέλας est vera lectio, et φίλους e margine in textum irrepserit*. We think this conjecture very probable. Compare below 8. 7. ὥστε τὸν μὲν ἀγαθὸν δεῖ φιλαυτὸν εἶναι· τὸν δὲ μοχθηρὸν οὐ δεῖ· βλάψει γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς πέλας, φαύλους πάθεσιν ἐπόμενος.

IX. 7. 2. κἂν μηδὲν ὥσι χρήσιμοι μηδ' εἰς ὕστερον γένοιοντ' ἂν. The

¹ The reader will find sufficient information on this word by consulting Hesychius in βρενθινά and βρενθιον, the Etymologist in βρενθιον, βρενθια, and βρενθύναι, Bekker's Anecdota p. 228. 10. and Athenæus xv. p. 690 D. E.

² We have made several alterations in this passage, which is imperfect, though intelligible as we give it; and must refer our critical readers to the original to decide whether they are correct. We will also take the liberty of setting down the next sentence, as it completes the sense: καὶ ὥς τῶν μεγάλων εἶναι δεσποτῶν, μετὰ διασυρμού καὶ μόλις πού βραχείας ἀπὸ νρίσιως ὑπὸ προχῆν ἑμφανίσουσιν, ἄλλου δ' οὐδένα ἀνδρῶν ἰννοῦσι. καὶ τοῦτον δ' Ἀριστοφάνης ὅτι βρενθύνει τ' ἐν ταῖσιν ἰδοῖς καὶ τῶν θαλμῶν παραβάλλει ἰσχυρίων. The latter part is rather mutilated in the manuscript; but we conceive that no one will doubt of the correctness of our restoration who will compare the Clouds of Aristophanes, v. 363.

change of mood in this sentence caused Zell to suspect some corruption, who begins indeed by saying that *in promptu est conjectere post κᾶν excidisse particulam ei*; but, though he is of opinion that the use of the Greek verb is governed by certain *laws*, yet he cannot approve of the *rules* by which some critics would straighten and confine the free and flexible language of the Greeks. This distinction between laws and rules we confess our inability to appreciate, or even to discern; but thus much at least is clear, that the insertion of *ei* after *κᾶν* does not at all mend the matter. See our remarks above on vii. 7. 1. Now, in the first place, it seems pretty certain that *ἐάν*, *ἤν*, and *ἄν* (for *ἐάν*),¹ are *always* followed by a subjunctive; and secondly, that *ἐάν* is *never* (as far as we have observed) followed by *ἄν*, inasmuch as it is itself contracted from *ei ἄν*. For instance, we apprehend that neither *ἐάν λέγοι* nor *ἐάν λέγῃ ἄν* are admissible. See Hermann ad Viger. Nos. 291. 326. 328.² There have been doubts as to particular passages, which however seem gradually to yield to the ingenuity and industry of

¹ It is indeed doubtful whether *ἄν* was used for *ἐάν* or *ἤν* in Aristotle's time. Porson Aristophan. p. 126. proposed to correct all the passages in which it occurs; but afterwards (as Mr. Dobree informs us in the Addenda) changed his opinion, and thought it admissible in the later comic poets. It seems to occur only once in Aristophanes, viz. Vesp. 97. where Dindorf prints *ἤν*. In a fragment of Anaxandrides, who was an early cotemporary of Aristotle's, Dr. Elmsley, Ed. Review, vol. iii. changes *ἄν* into *ἤν*. It seems that Thucydides always uses *ἐάν* or *ἤν*; see Goeller ad iii. 46. A reason for supposing that *ἄν* was early used for *ἐάν* seems to be, that *κᾶν* is found in the tragic poets. But Mr. Hermann (ad Viger. No. 291.) agrees with Dr. Burney, *Atticos poetas nunquam ἄν pro ἐάν, sed semper ἤν dicere*. See Elmsley ad Heracl. 1020. But we observe *ἄν* written in a Herculanæum Ms. which, though it proves nothing for the age of Aristotle, yet goes back to a very respectable antiquity: Herculanensia, (Oxford, 1824.) vol. i. part 1. p. 21. l. 10. οὐδέν τι φασκᾶται κατέχων καὶ οὐ συνῶν ὅσα ἄλλα δέεται τριβῆς, ἄν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς γίνηται μισθοῦ καθάπερ τὰ τῆς ποιητικῆς μέρη. We are aware that this is a very long note on a very trifling question; but (though perhaps we may differ from Mr. Cardwell) we think that it would not be difficult to prove the utility of verbal criticism; and *that* being once granted, it is useless to cavil at any *particular* remark, however trivial it may seem, as no one can say that it may not become a powerful instrument of inquiry in more skilful hands. For instance, a very minute grammatical objection may overthrow the authenticity of a book; which is sometimes a point of very great importance.

² Hermann seems to think that in later writers, Lucian for instance, *ἐάν* may govern an optative. In the passage, however, which he cites, *ei*, the common reading, is probably correct. But the verse of Maximus *πρὸ καταρχῶν*, quoted after Schæfer by Hermann, *Opuscula*, vol. i. p. 283. is doubtless now printed as it came from the hand of that classical writer; and we are quite willing to allow to the defenders of *ἐάν* with an optative the full weight of his authority. See also Mr. Knight's Proleg. Hom. § 149. 151.

critics. Thus Matthiæ quotes in his Greek Grammar (§ 525 b), a passage from Isocrates, in which ἦν governs an optative; but Bekker has restored *ei* from a manuscript (p. 226. ed. Oxon.). The various conjectures on Thucydides iii. 44. may be seen in Goeller's note. " *Ἄν pro εἰν positum* (says Schweighæuser Lex. Polyb. in v.) *cum indicativo construitur rariori usu*, ix. 31. 2. *ἄν δὲ καὶ προκατέχεσθε καὶ προδιειλήφατε περὶ τούτων.*" Read *ei δὲ καὶ*. The usage of Aristotle is so constant in this respect, that in the passage before us we should not hesitate to read *μηδ' εἰς ὕστερον γέγονται*.¹

IX. 12. We give the last words of the 9th and first of the 10th book in connexion. *Περὶ μὲν οὖν φιλίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω* [ἐπόμμενον δ' ἂν εἴη διελθεῖν περὶ ἡδονῆς.] *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἡδονῆς ἴσως ἔπεται διελθεῖν.* If these words were thus written by Aristotle, we confess that every thing we said above on the last chapters of the 7th book falls to the ground. But we cannot help suspecting that the clause which we have enclosed in brackets is to be attributed to the industry of some transcriber or reviser of the text. We know that they frequently permitted themselves such liberties at the end of books. (See e. g. Mr. Knight's notes on Homer in many places, and the end of the 1st book of Aristotle's Rhetoric in the second Oxford edition, 1826.) Perhaps, indeed, the clause in question is only a variation of the first sentence of the following book (compare the reading of the Flor. Ms. at the end of Book iv.).

IX. 8. 6. *καὶ ἐγκρατὴς δὴ καὶ ἀκρατὴς λέγεται.* Two manuscripts, and some editions, have *καὶ ἐγκρατὴς δὲ καὶ*, &c., which seems to us a preferable reading.

X. 2. 3. We would make a similar change in this passage; and for *τοιούτω δὴ λόγῳ*, read *τοιούτω δὲ λόγῳ*. The correctness of these slight alterations can of course be only determined by comparing the context, in order to see whether or not an illative particle, such as *δή*, is admissible.

X. 2. 4. *οἱ δ' ἐνίστάμενοι ὥς οὐκ ἀγαθὸν οὗ πάντ' ἐφίεται μὴ οὐδὲν λέγουσιν.* Read *μὴ οὐδὲν λέγουσιν.* *Οὐδὲν λέγουσιν* signifies, literally, *talk nonsense*; and the *μὴ* used in this manner rather qualifies and softens the assertion. This is the reading of a Paris manuscript; see Zell ad x. 1. 3. whose note appears to us to make out the point beyond a doubt, and Goettling ad Aristot. Polit. p.

¹ Topic. i. 16. 2. *ἰὰν μὴ πρὸς ταῦτ' τὸν λόγον ποιῆται ὁ ἔρωτων.* Read *ποιῆται*. The same correction is to be made Topic. ii. 5. 1. *ὅταν πρὸς ταῦτα τοῦ λόγου ποιῆται.* Eth. Mag. i. 10. p. 14. 26. read *ἰὰν ἔχῃ*; and see Elmsley ad Eurip. Iph. A. 1171. Quarterly Review, vol. vii. p. 459. We have collected all the places in the last five books of these Ethics in which *ἰὰν*, and *ἂν* or *κἂν* (for *εἰαν* or *καὶ ἰὰν*), occur. They are thirty-five in number; and, with the exception which we have noticed, are all followed by the subjunctive mood. It is unnecessary to trouble the reader with so long a list of references. Bekker Anecd. p. 144. 31. *Ἐάν' καὶ τοῦτο, ὥσπερ τὸ εἰ, ὀριστικοῖς, ἐκτικτοῖς, ὑποτακτικοῖς συγτάσσεται. σὺ δὲ, ὡφιλολόγι, (τὸ) ἀνάλογον φυλάττων, ὑποτακτικοῖς αἰὲ συντάσσει.* So we say to Mr. Cardwell.

312. Compare also Magn. Mor. i. 34. p. 35. 2. ἀλλὰ μὴ ποτε ταῦτα οὐκ ἀληθῆ ἦν οὐδ' ἐνδέχεται αὐτὸν ἀδικεῖν αὐτόν.

X. 3. 6. καὶ λέγουσι δὲ τὴν μὲν λύπην ἐνδεΐαι τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἶναι, τὴν δ' ἡδονὴν ἀναπλήρωσιν· ταῦτα δὲ σωματικά ἐστι τὰ πάθη. Thus Mr. Cardwell, from the Florence manuscript, for ἐστι πάθη. But, with all submission to his judgment, we must be permitted to say that this seems to us about as good Greek as *these are bodily the affections* would be English.

X. 4. 3. εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ φορὰ κίνησις πόθεν πρῶτ, καὶ ταύτης διαφοραὶ κατ' εἶδη, πτήσις, βάδις, αἰσις, τὰ τοιαῦτα . . . Compare Topic. iv. 2. 7. ἔτι εἰ τὸ γένος εἰς τὸ εἶδος ἔθηκεν, οἶον ὡς Πλάτων ὀρίζεται φορὰν τὴν κατὰ τύπον κίνησιν . . . οὐδ' ἡ κατὰ τύπον μεταβολὴ πᾶσα φορὰ. ἡ γὰρ βάδις οὐ δοκεῖ φορὰ εἶναι σχεδὸν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκουσίως τύπον ἐκ τύπου μεταβαλλόντων λέγεται, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσίων συμβαίνει. It seems singular that Aristotle should have changed his opinion as to the use of a word; but the received reading is, we think, sufficiently defended by a passage quoted by Zell, to which we refer the reader.

X. 4. 9. πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἀδυνάτεϊ συνεχῶς ἐνεργεῖν· οὐ γίνεται οὖν οὐδ' ἡδονή· ἔπειτα γὰρ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ. The author of a *New Translation of the Nicomachean Ethics* (Oxford, 1826.) p. 314. proposes οὐ δύναται οὖν, which correction seems to us necessary.

X. 4. 10. μετέπειτα δὲ οὐ τοιαύτη ἡ ἐνέργεια. This is the reading of the Florence Ms.; the editions have μετέπειτα δὲ οὐ γίνεται τοιαύτη. We would however preserve δέ, as there appears to be no inference.

X. 5. 1. τὰ ὑπὸ τέχνης. Zell proposes τὰ ἀπὸ τέχνης, and supports his emendation with much learning. We apprehend that this is another instance of the corruption of the text by *contagion*, which we noticed above; for the preposition ὑπὸ occurs immediately before and immediately after.

X. 7. 6. περιποιουμένη τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς πολίταις, ἐτέραν οὖσαν τῆς πολιτικῆς, ἣν καὶ ζητοῦμεν. [δῆλον ὡς ἐτέραν οὖσαν.] It seems clear that the words which we have enclosed in brackets are merely a different reading of ἐτέραν οὖσαν.

X. 8. 7. Aristotle wishes to show that the Gods are not moral agents; "for," he asks, "what actions shall we attribute to them? Can they be just to one another? Or is it not ridiculous to suppose them making bargains and giving back deposits? Can they be liberal? But to whom are they to give? ἀποπον δὲ (he continues) εἰ καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς νόμισμα ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, i. e. *indeed it would be absurd to suppose so, even if they had money or something equivalent to it.*" Now this remark appears to us a complete *contresens*: Aristotle never would make the hypothesis, even for the argument's sake, that the Gods made use of money; we therefore propose ἀποπον δὲ καὶ εἰ ἔσται, &c. *It is absurd too to suppose that they have such a thing as money.* It should be observed, more-

over, that if the sense was as we first rendered it, Aristotle would probably have written, not *ἔσται*, but *ἔστιν*.

x. 8. 8. οὐδαμῇ. Thus Mr. Cardwell for οὐδαμοῦ from his manuscript. As, however, he writes πῇ (VII. 8. 3. VII. 13. 1. IX. 8. 3. IX. 9. 4.),¹ this should be written οὐδαμῇ.

x. 9. 6. ὁ δὲ λόγος καὶ ἡ διδαχὴ μὴ ποτε οὐκ ἐν ἀπᾶσιν ισχύει. The Florence Ms. has ἐνισχύει: a Breslau Ms., and the Aldine and Basle editions, ισχύει. See our remarks above on x. 2. 4. We prefer the reading of the best manuscript, as the same verb occurs in the same context below, § 14. ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς πολέσιν ἐνισχύει τὰ νόμιμα. And for δὲ afterwards in this passage read δεῖ.

We have collected the following list of errata, some of which Mr. Cardwell would do well to notice in his second volume, as they affect the sense and may perplex the reader.

P. xxviii. l. 5. for *sexto* read *septimo*. l. 2. 5. τοιαύτη for ταιαύτη. l. 5. 2. ὃ τε for ὅ, τε. l. 7. 10. ἔργον for ἔργόν. l. 8. 7. ἐν γέ τι for ἐν γε τι. l. 9. 4. ἐνδέχεται. ib. 14. Τρωικοῖς for Τρωίκαις. l. 12. 6. ἔργων for ἔργών. l. 13. 2. μάλιστα for μάλιστά. l. 13. 7. ὀφθαλμοῦς for ὀφθαλμούς. l. 13. 12. ἀνθρωπίνη for ἀνθρωπινῇ. ib. 15. ψυχῆς for ψυχῦς. ib. 18. μνηύει for μνηεύει. II. 3. 10. κακός. II. 6. 14. ἐπιτυχεῖν. p. 59. title, lib. II. cap. IX. for lib. I. cap. VIII. II. 8. 8. ἐσμεν for ἐσμέν. III. 1. 9. διακρίναι for διακρίναι. III. 2. 10. αἶδια for αἶδια. ib. 11. οὐδεῖς for οὐδεῖς. ib. 16. οὐδέν for οὐδέν. ib. ποῖον τι ἐστίν for ποῖον τι ἐστίν. ib. 17. ἄρα γε for ἄρα γε. III. 3. 19. κρίναντες. III. 5. 21. τό τε for τό, τε. ib. 22. πρόσθεσις. III. 7. 6. καλόν. III. 9. 2. ἀπέχεσθαι. III. 10. 2. φιλομαθία for φιλομάθεια. III. 11. 7. εἰ δέ τῃ for εἰ δὲ τῃ. ib. 8. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον for τὸ δ' τοιοῦτον. IV. 2. 10. ἀρετὴ for ἀρετῇ. ib. 22. κακταῖ for κακταῖ. IV. 3. 7. ἐλαττόνων for ἐλλαττόνων. IV. 3. 12. ἀξίωμα. ib. 29. ζῆν. IV. 5. 11. διαλλαττόμενος for διαλλαττόμενος. IV. 6. 4. ἐπιεικῇ for ἐπιεικῇ. IV. 7. 13. προσποιούνται for προσποιούντοι. IV. 8. 5. ἐλευθερίου for ἐλευθέριον. IV. 8. 11, note, ἀναγκαῖον for ἀναγκαῖον. IV. 9. 8. οὐδ' ἢ for οὐδ' ἢ. V. 1. 15, note, ταύτη. V. 3. 5. ἀνάγκη for ἀνάγκη. V. 4. 3. ἴσον τι for ἴσόν τι. V. 5. 13. οἶνου for οἶνου. V. 6. 4. ζητούμενόν ἐστι for ζητούμενον ἐστι. ib. ἀλλὰ τι for ἀλλὰ τι. V. 7. 1 and 4. read νόμιμον three times (cf. νομίμων, § 6.). ib. 5. ταῦτα for ταῦτα, πολιτεῖται for πολιτεῖται. V. 9. 3. ἀμφοτέρων. VI. 5. 4. τέλος. ib. 5. ἡδὺ for ἡδύ. VI. 7. 6. πρακτῶν for πρακτῶν. VI. 11. 1. φαμεν for φαμέν. VI. 12. 7. καί. ib. 10. δυνάμεις for δυνάμεις. VI. 13. 1. τᾶλλα. Elsewhere Mr. Cardwell writes τᾶλλα (IV. 1. 13. 3, 18.). VII. 3. 8, note, μαθόντες for ματόντες. VII. 5. 2. κατεσθίειν for κατεσθίειν. VII. 5. 8. ἀνθρωπ(γ)ην for ἀνθρωπινῇ. VII. 11. 4. φεύγει for φεύγει. VII. 12. 1. ὀλίγον. VII. 13. 6, note, τὰ for τὰ. VII. 14. 4. ἡδονὴ for ἡδονῇ. VIII. 1. 4. στάσις for στάσις. VIII. 2. 3. φίλῃ.

¹ But I. 13. 13. πῇ. I. 13. 15. II. 7. 6. πῇ.

VIII. 3 7. πάνθ. VIII. 5. 3. συζῆν. VIII. 7. 4. ἀρίστοις. VIII. 8. 4. φίλοι. VIII. 10. 1. δέ for δὲ. ib. 5. ἀλλὰ. IX. 2. 1. χειροτονητέον for χειροτωνητέον. ib. 3. ἐταίρω for ἐταίρω. ib. 8. ἐπαρκεῖν for ἐπαρχεῖν. IX. 8. 1. πάντα πράττειν for πάνταπράττειν. IX. 11. 2. ἄν τις for ἄν τις. IX. 12. 2. ζῆν. X. 3. 3. πᾶσιν ἐστίν. X. 4. 3. τόπω for πόπω. ib. 5. αἰσθησὶν ἐστίν for αἰσθησιν ἐστίν. X. 5. 5. ἐνεργεία for ἐνεργεῖα. X. 6. 2. ἐνέργειάν for ἐνέργειά. X. 7. 9. καὶ. X. 9. 16. τῷ. ib. 18. διανοία for διανοία. X. 9. 18. there is something omitted in the first note. II. 2. 9. read ἄνδρες, καὶ γινόμενοι μάλιστα, &c.

Mr. Cardwell three times writes οἰνωμένος for οἰνώμενος (VII. 3. 7. VII. 10. 3. VII. 14. 6.); and therefore we conclude that he does so systematically, and means it to be the perfect participle; which should however be ὀνωμένος. See Elms. ad Bacch. 686.

We should also state that Mr. Cardwell prints the heads of the chapters in capital letters, over which he marks the breathings and accents. For the lene and aspirate, he gives the half H's, as in old manuscripts; and the circumflex he denotes by a capital lambda, like the French circumflex. We confess, that in our eyes there is more novelty than merit in this mode of writing, particularly as we are accustomed to see capitals in inscriptions, &c. without any such marks. The union of accents and capital letters appears therefore somewhat incongruous. Indeed, for our own parts, we should have been inclined to give up the divisions of chapters as inconvenient; and have merely noted the numbers on the margin for the sake of reference.

We have now laid before the reader a sufficient number of changes in the received text; some made on the authority of the Florence manuscript, some from other sources, according to Mr. Cardwell's judgment, and some few proposed by ourselves; to enable him to judge of the merits of this new edition. It will perhaps occur to him that the editor has often relied with too implicit confidence on that which has at times been a rotten staff, his new manuscript. That the readings of this manuscript are better than those of any or all of the others which have been collated, and that they frequently exhibit the true text when it cannot be traced elsewhere, we readily admit; sed *emendata videri Pulcraque et exactis minimum distantia* miror. It is not often indeed that the reader of a classical work has occasion to complain that the editor has been too sparing of conjectural emendation. In the present edition, however, with the exception of a masculine termination changed into a feminine, some words which have been marked as spurious, and we believe some other slight change,¹ the printed

¹ ἰδιᾶς for ἰδιοί, III. 11. 1. διὰ τὸ τοῦ; for διὰ τοῦς, X. 6. 3. See also III. 8. 11. IV. 3. 15. V. 2. 9. VI. 8. 2.

text faithfully follows that of published or manuscript authorities. Whereby, as we conceive, it has been sometimes left in a more obscure or imperfect state than was perhaps necessary. We should conjecture from this, as well as from other circumstances in the work before us, that Mr. Cardwell has not a high opinion of the utility of verbal criticism; that he despises a craft which has been successfully practised by persons of slender abilities; and that he has considered the publication of the text as a necessary but disagreeable condition for the appearance of his commentary, which the title-page announces, and which will be contained in the second volume. We are confirmed in this opinion by the inequality of the learned editor's labors; for while we constantly admire a nice sense and discrimination of the finer shades and delicacies of the Greek language, which cannot be learnt from books, and is only the result of long habit, we are occasionally startled by an oversight which is evidently to be attributed to the want of sufficient consideration. These remarks we make with sincerity and freedom, from a persuasion that Mr. Cardwell would despise the fame of having gained the highest excellence in a department of knowledge which he considers of little importance. In the next volume (of which, when it appears, we will not fail to give our readers a full account) he will find a wider field, and one more worthy of his knowledge and abilities. Much, indeed, has been done in particular parts to explain passages and sentences of these *Ethics*; but a commentary which shall be satisfactory and not prolix, which shall combine the interpretation of particular passages with an explanation of the philosopher's moral system, and in which the grammatical shall be separated from the other annotations, is still a desideratum. And that Mr. Cardwell is able to do this, and to do it well, we entertain no doubt. Such a body of notes would not be merely curious, or interesting only to the antiquarian and philologist; but they would be highly useful, by facilitating the knowledge of an admirable practical manual of morality. That Aristotle meant this work as such, he himself more than once declares;¹ and that he has succeeded in his attempt, few who have really studied this treatise will deny. But he is a

¹ It is almost useless to refer to particular passages: but see i. 3. 6. 7. i. 5. 13. ii. 2. 1. ii. 4. 6. and particularly x. 8. 12. where Aristotle exhorts his readers to examine all his statements and arguments, by a comparison with real life and actions, and, if they agree with the reality, to admit them; but if they disagree, to consider them as empty words: see also the last chapter of Book i. Nothing indeed can be a greater mistake than to suppose that Aristotle is a dogmatical writer. He is, in fact, singularly, and sometimes unnecessarily, scrupulous about making an assertion. And his *perhaps* (*isws*) is frequently inserted where other authors would be much more positive.

dry and concise writer, most inaccurate in style, and in his mode of handling subjects most methodical; in which respect he is diametrically opposed to recent authors, who commonly pay more attention to the style than the plan of their works. He is also more fond of divisions and classifications than the majority of modern writers on moral philosophy. When to these circumstances we add the difficulty always felt at acquiring a familiarity with the metaphysical vocabulary of a foreign tongue, it will not be wondered that careless readers have felt the want of a proper guide, and, mistaking the accident for the essence, have thought that the Ethics of Aristotle were a mere collection of verbal distinctions and catalogues of human actions without use or object. Thus a modern historian of Greece informs us, that "in reading his Ethics we can hardly fail to be impressed with the idea that, while Plato teaches men to feel and act, the object of Aristotle is rather to instruct them how to define and classify their actions. On abstract questions, especially of morals, he wants Plato's liveliness and *distinctness* of conception; and hence his treatment of such subjects is comparatively dry and barren. Inaccuracies are pointed out, and language and arrangement improved; but *little is done to open the mind to the reception of truth, &c. &c.*" We are sorry to see a writer, who has in other parts of his little history shown some originality of thought and inquiry, condescend to pick up the vulgar opinions of the day on one of the first, if not the very first, of the many philosophers which the great nation whose destinies he narrates brought forth.¹ A few lines before,

¹ Compare with this censure the opinions of a writer of a History of Philosophy lately published at Paris, and belonging to a collection very similar to that edited by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. *Aristote entra dans la lice avec des armes qui, pour être moins brillantes que celles de Platon, n'en étaient peut-être que plus redoutables: s'il ne possédait pas, comme son maître, l'art d'enflammer l'imagination et d'exalter l'esprit, il avait le mérite plus rare d'exercer sur la raison un empire absolu. Chez lui, la dissertation était toujours féconde, et la démonstration irrésistible; d'abord, parce qu'il y portait sa puissante sagacité, son savoir prodigieux, la clarté de sa méthode, et l'activité opiniâtre de son génie; ensuite, parce qu'il appliquait toutes les ressources de cette intelligence supérieure à un ordre de recherches qui avait pour but la réalité, et où l'expérience pouvait redresser ses erreurs ou sanctionner ses découvertes.* Résumé de l'Histoire de la Philosophie, par P. M. Laurent, p. 136-8. (The expression *activité opiniâtre de génie*, for the diligence of thought and unwearied activity of mind which so distinguish Aristotle, is exceedingly happy.)

We have cited this passage at full length, in order to contrast it with the parallel which we have introduced in the text. They are both taken from works written for, and probably enjoying, a general circulation. But how refreshing is it in the one work to see, not a compilation, but an original sketch; and to meet with the fresh thoughts of a well-informed mind, instead of the common-place remarks and censures on

too, he borrows a feeble and now refuted objection against the logical system of Aristotle,¹ from a writer, eloquent indeed, and of a singular delicacy of thought and expression, but little versed in the ancient philosophy, and who on this occasion criticises the great work of Aristotle on the credit of an author who himself acknowledges that he never read through the book which he professed to analyse.²

Since this article went to the press, we have noticed some passages which had escaped our observation, and which we must beg our readers' pardon for adding in this place.

The first is v. 4. 5. λέγεται γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις, κἂν εἰ μή τισιν οἰκεῖον ὄνομα εἴη, τὸ κέρδος. There is some misprint in Mr. Cardwell's note; but we suppose that the Florence Ms. has ἦ for εἴη. Read, therefore, κἂν μή τισιν οἱ. ὅν. ἦ. See our remarks on i. 9. 3. and vii. 7. 1. Thus Arist. Pol. p. 328 D. E. ὥστε ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ πολιτείᾳ τιμᾶσθαι τὸν πλοῦτον, ἄλλως τε κἂν τύχῃσι γυναικοκρατούμενοι, καθάπερ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ πολεμικῶν γενῶν, ἔξω Κελτῶν ἢ κἂν εἰ τινες ἕτεροι τετιμῆκασιν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἄρρενας συνουσίαν. For ἦ κἂν εἰ Schneider would read κἂν εἰ, Coraës καὶ εἰ. It seems to us quite clear that ἦ εἰ should be written, and that κἂν, which destroys both the sense and syntax, was repeated from above. Secondly, we omitted to mention that in Arist. Rhet. II. 25. 10. for ἂν οὕτως ἐλύθη should be read ἂν οὕτω λυθῇ.

We have likewise since seen a paper by Schleiermacher in the Berlin Transactions for 1816-17 on the Greek Scholiasts to this treatise of Aristotle; in which he mentions (p. 276) from a communication of Professor Brandis, the existence of an unpublished commentary to the end of the 7th book. And he states that, in a mutilated passage of it, a hint is given that the last part of this book is "not by Aristotle but by Eudemus, as Aristotle afterwards in the *Nicomachean Ethics* treats of pleasure as if he had not before mentioned the subject." Whether by this it is meant that the doubtful chapters properly belong to the Eudemean Ethics, (where, as is well known, they occur at the end of the 6th book,) we do not pretend to decide. But we still retain our opinion that they are the work of Aristotle, and are *not* in their place in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

G. C. L.

Aristotle, repeated by so many authors, that they are at last become threadbare, and their nakedness begins to be apparent.

¹ "In attempting to demonstrate the conclusiveness of demonstration, his logical works are essentially unphilosophical." *History of Greece, published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, part v. p. 153. Compare *Whately's Logic*, p. 33.

² Mr. Stewart's *Philosophy of the Human Mind*, vol. ii. p. 397, note, ed. 2.

REVIEW OF

The SECOND GREEK DELECTUS, or New ANALECTA MINORA; intended to be read in Schools, between Dr. VALPY'S Greek Delectus and PROFESSOR DALZEL'S Volumes of Analecta Majora. With English Notes, and a copious Greek and English Lexicon. By the Rev. F. E. J. VALPY, M.A. of Trin. Coll. Camb., and one of the Masters of Reading School. 9s. 6d. bound. Longman.

WE had often wondered that none of the English literati had ever been inclined to follow the hint given them by Mr. Dalzel; and to publish, for the benefit of English youth, works corresponding to those written for the service of the Scotch. We had wondered that no fair rivalry has arisen on the part of English scholars, and incited some of them to attempt a competition with the Professor beyond the Tweed.

Such an attempt, however, has now been made by Mr. Valpy. He has retained some parts of Mr. Dalzel's collection from the Greek writers, but the greater part of his selection is new. He has omitted the extracts from Lucian and Xenophon, and has substituted extracts from Ælian, Polyænus, Homer, and Herodotus, and from the easiest parts of Euripides, Sophocles, Æschylus, and Aristophanes; and has made a happier selection from Xenophon than Mr. Dalzel.

But a more important difference is, that the Lexicon and Notes are in English. We have been often witnesses to the complete neglect of Dalzel's notes by schoolboys, because they were written in Latin; and we have known, perhaps in propriis personis, those who have contented themselves with knowing the Latin for a Greek word, without knowing the English for it! It is time that an end should be put to the pernicious system of rendering Greek by Latin words, which are just as much a matter of mystery and enigma as the original itself. Mr. Valpy, the printer, has already had the cruelty to tear from the lovers of Græco-Latino translators the Latin labors of the school Schrevelius.

The notes of Dalzel are also often too long and verbose, and affectedly critical. We say this without fear of being contradicted: λέγομεν γὰρ τοῖς εἰδόσι. In the lesser Analecta this is wonderfully silly; for it is seldom that its readers know enough

of Latin to be able to construe at all, far less to read with pleasure and profit, the critical labors of that writer. But even in his larger *Analectas*, the notes might, in our opinion, be curtailed at least half, and that without losing their most valuable parts.

Mr. Valpy's notes are short and explanatory. He has taken pains to explain the Greek ellipses; and has given a full account of what is a deviation from the common rules of conjugations and of syntax.

In his *Lexicon* he has paid great attention to the derivation of Greek words. We would willingly extract, if we had time and room, some of those which appear new and important, as well as a postscript, in which the writer explains, more fully and intelligibly than we have yet seen, the etymological systems of Valckenaer and Lennep. But we invite our readers to peruse the work itself, and they will glean from it many observations on Greek etymology which are both curious and useful to know. In a word, to those masters who are desirous of substituting English notes and explanations in the room of Latin, and who are desirous of leading their scholars to an intimate acquaintance with the derivation of numerous Greek words, and with numerous words which flow from the Greek into the Latin and English languages,—to all such we earnestly recommend the present work, and wish them the satisfaction and profit in the perusal which we have experienced.

LAUDES SUTTONIANÆ.

Oratio habita in Ædibus Carthusianis, recitante CECIL EDUARDO GEORGIO LUKIN, pridie idus Decembres, A. S. 1828.

PRÆSES DIGNISSIME,

QUI, Virorum magnorum, quæ fuerint virtutes, quantæ et quales res gestæ, rectè æstimare velint, eos profectò, non ipsos tantùm homines intueri, sed et sæculorum, quibus illi orti sint et floruerint, mores et studia considerare oportet. Nam multos, quos sua excellentia minimè illustrasset, nobiles Fortuna reddidit, atque idonea tempora ad altissimos honores evexerunt.

Comparandi autem sunt, similes cum similibus, et simili

loco positis, æquales cum æqualibus. Cum Nautâ scilicet confertur Nauta; sed, non pari laude dignum censemus, si quis tranquillo mari in portum delabatur, atque illum, qui, gravi exortâ tempestate, quàm cæteræ naves fractæ fuerint atque demersæ, suam unus conservârit. Neque olim, qui cæteros Olympiæ vicisset, illi palmam adjudicans arbiter, id quærebat, Hiero Syracusanus celerius an tardius equitasset.

Et hæc quidem omnia, quæ dixi, ad rem nostram, et orationem hodiernam pertinent. Præsuli nempè Primario, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, morte paucis abhinc mensibus, abrepto, jam parentandum esse quis non censet? Delato autem munere perfungens, pro meo quantulocunque ingenio, ille, qui fuerit, qualis, cum aliis comparatus, videatur, et nobis quo nomine carus veniat commendatusque, eâ, quâ potero diligentia, exponam.

Nam Carolus, Atavis Avoque ortus Rutlandiæ Ducibus, filius Georgii, qui, Suttonus, ex nobilissimâ Mannersiorum gente, tantum non princeps, cognomine appellabatur, quum Etonâ, ubi prima litterarum rudimenta hauserat, in has ædes, unâ cum Fratre suo, Hiberniæ summo, non ita pridem, Cancellario, feliciter migrasset, Crusium, apud quem commorabatur, pluribus annis audiebat. Hinc Cantabrigiam, summâ cum suorum expectatione, profectus, nullâ voluit nobilitatis indulgentiâ uti, nullum per inertiam et luxuriam tempus terere; sed animi sui ingeniique vires, artium bonarum studio et scientiâ, adeo excoluit, ut publici illum Baccalaureorum Examinatores non honesto tantum in gradu collocarent, sed et nomen illius in primas Academiæ tabulas referrent. Inde Theologiæ deditus, agresti hominum gregi sacra præcapiens, tirocinium suum, Sacerdos, explevit. Sed, quum diu latere non posset, ad Decanatum in Ecclesiâ Petroburgiensi mox evectus, non tam majora ambire coepit, quàm dignus haberi, ad quem, cæteris omnibus posthabitis, amplissimi honores deferrentur. Tum verò, Episcopum a Norvicensibus salutatum, Vindesoriam Suttonum Rex ipse accersivit, Ecclesiæ, quam propriam usque vindicabat, præficiendum. Suttonus tandem, quem vox populi jam diu designarat, Cantuariæ vacante sede, non tam favore regio, quàm Regis jussu, primas tulit, et loco potitus est arduo illo excelsoque, ex quo, quasi despectari videtur, quicquid sit inter homines altum et magnificum, nihil certè conspici potest, Regio genere excepto, quod non sit secundum.

Sed furor iste civium, qui, cæteris nationibus stragem minitatus, Galliam funditus labefactam conquassârat, illis temporibus jam defervescebat. Tanto autem ex tumultu, non faciliè hominum mentes pacari et conquiescere, nec vivida vis animi, excitata semel, et accensa, aut extinguì poterat, aut intra justos limites concludi. Quod quùm perspicerent optimi quidam homines, atque iidem constantissimi, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ atque Reipublicæ perniciosum id fore credebant, si, vanis rerum imaginibus corruptum, falsa pro veris, pro honestis speciosa, vulgus sequeretur. Neque aliâ arte, malo, quod impendebat, occurri posse omnes consentiebant, neque alii remedio locum esse, quàm si, Scholis, in singulis ferè oppidis vicisque Britanniae, fundatis, ad veterem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ disciplinam pueri informarentur, atque universi erudirentur. Consulentibus verò, qualem desiderarent, Patrum ultrò se obtulit Suttonus. Nôrat enim ille Scientiam, quâ nihil pulcrius, nihil honestius est, nihil utilius, si verâ Religione hominum animi teneantur, candem deformem fieri, noxiam, detestabilem, si vel omninò respuatur Dei cultus, vel minoris, quàm par sit, habeatur. Felici ergò occasione usus, id sedulò providebat, ut, per novam institutionem, infantium animi, quùm aliorum utilium, tum præcipuè sacrarum rerum, notitiâ imbuerentur; neu cui hominum paupertas impedimento esset, quo minùs is Dei Verbum acciperet, vel acceptum intelligeret. Neque id auspiciis tantum suis et auctoritate, sed et agendo, consulendo, hortando ipse efficiebat. Quoties illum examinandis pueris præesse vidimus? Quoties benè merentibus præmia suâ manu distribuere, sperantem scilicet id fore, ut, quùm ipsi, disciplinis ingenuis instituti, et honestâ laude incitati, fierent meliores, tum etiam, Ecclesia, moribus suorum in melius mutatis, stabiliiretur simul, et conservaretur?

Ecclesiam, sanè, Anglicanam, non tantum, quia ipse in eâdem summum locum obtinebat, sed quia ejusdem disciplinam ad veterum Apostolorum instituta proximè accedere, et, præceptis ejus parere qui vellent, eos Magno Christianæ Fidei Auctori maximè placituros arbitrabatur, illam administrare, foverè, sustentare, Suttonus animo suo nunquam non propositum habebat, infixumquè. Idem interea, ab Ecclesiæ auctoritate si qui abhorrerent, iis nihil oneris imponi, nihil, quod non postularet Reipublicæ salus, imperitari voluit; et, conciliandos hominum animos, non constringendos, quùm censeret, leges nonnullas, ex quibus,

His verò missis, age, cum Archiepiscopis, Archiepiscopum, Suttonum conferas; cum iis, quos vel celeberrimos jactat Cantuaria.

Sunt sanè qui, nullo non ævo memorandi, id suum vindicant, quòd Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ disciplinam priscis atque arduis temporibus instituerunt. Quem vero illi locum, excellenti virtute meriti, occupârint, in eum ne quis posterorum advena invadat.

Sed, maximè laudabiles singulorum quæ fuerint artes, eas Suttono quis non tribuat? siquid singuli, vel sæculorum vitio, vel suâ indole, deliquerint, id Suttono quis objiciat? Neque enim non evenerunt tempora, quibus, vel pertinacia, vel rerum inscitia, vel incuria, quicquid ubique sanctum esset et venerabile, summum in discrimen projecisset. Aliis sanè permagnum est posse exemplis uti: quàm pauci verò utuntur?

Singulare autem illud Suttonus suum vindicat, quòd, per tres et viginti ampliùs annos Cantuariæ Archiepiscopus qui fuerit, alios omnes, a Cranmero usque, tanti muneris habendi tempore superavit; singulare illud, quòd in viam, quam alii monstrârant, et pæne in illorum vestigia ingressus, non tam præcedentes ipse sequi visus est, quàm aliis, qui ipsum sequantur, quicquid asperum fuerit, atque arduum, id omne tollere atque explanare.

Sacras literas, quarum copiam populo alii fecerant ex Hebraico Græcoque sermone in Anglicum versarum, easdem, populo quæ fierent notiores, Suttonus notulis illustrandas curavit.

Clericis et Sacerdotibus multa, olim ab aliis præscripta, Suttoni auspiciis in melius mutata sunt, atque eorundem hominum de muneribus, officiis, censu plura lege cauta et sancita, quæ præsentibus Ecclesiæ temporibus, nostrisque ætatibus, convenient.

Educandorum infantium et instituendorum auctorem sanè Suttonus et ducem habuit Cranmerum: sed quod Cranmerus ad stabiliendam Ecclesiam senserat pertinere, fierique studebat, id primus effecit Suttonus.

Suttonus clementiâ suâ et comitate inimicitias mollivit et pacavit. Suttonus Episcoporum auctoritatem domi munivit, atque novos Episcopos in novas terras, ad Insulas Occidentales, et in Indiam misit, impositâ suâ manu consecratos, atque Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ disciplinam remotissimis nationibus tradituros. Suttonus, nullo odio, nullâ

invidiâ lacessitus, vitam, cum desiderio omnium hominum, patriæ utilem, fructuosam Ecclesiæ, sibi gloriosam terminavit.

Ergò, quem alii desiderant, nos non desideramus? Quem cæteri honorant, nos non veneramur? Atqui ille, tot inter et tanta negotia, nos nostraque sedulò curabat: Carthusianis si quid læti vel fortunati contigisset, ipse unà gaudebat: Carthusianus, Carthusianos studiosè fovebat, Carthusianos unicè amabat: quæcunque rei Carthusianæ interessent, quæcunque ad Carthusianam domum illustrandam pertinerent, propria hæc sibi munera faciebat. Siquid porrò Custodibus nostris, in his ædibus, per tres illos et viginti ampliùs annos, agendum essèt, transigendum, deliberandum, semel tantum atque iterum, ipse non intererat et præerat. Nobis, denique, ille, actæ hinc olim pueritiæ memor, discentibus, ludentibus, res sacras obeuntibus, dormientibus, quasi caritate quâdam et cognitione devinctus, consulere videbar. Nos illum ademptum lugemus Amicum, Tutorem, Patronum, Patrem.

Sed et tu, Præses optime, consiliorum eorum, quæ nobis et prosint, et profutura sint, pars magna fuisti: et alterum tu consiliorum eorum socium et participem desideras, magnum illum excellentemque hominem, cui quindecim ferè annos commissa fuit summa Rerum publicarum administratio, illum, cui novendiales feriæ jam debentur, Carthusianum, domi Carthusianæ Custodem fidelissimum, diligentissimum, atque Carthusianorum amantissimum, alterum uno anno Carthusianis morte abreptum. Magis adeò, magisque id præcamur, ut tu, diu superstes, quod fecisti, nobis consulas. Id verò mihi vitio ne veritas, quod multus hodiè fui in alterius Suttoni laudibus: sed tali potius præconio ipsas Fundatoris nostri laudes optime prædicari, velim, et tu arbitreris.

OXFORD LATIN PRIZE POEM
FOR 1827.

MEXICA.

Longa est injuria, longæ

Ambages; sed summa sequar fastigia rerum. VIRO. *Æn.* i. 341.

IN geminos disjecta polos, ubi currit in utrum

America, et longo media internectitur isthmo,

Sola,¹ plagas inter vacuas, et barbara late
 Sæcla hominum, quibus antra domus, sylvæque profundæ,
 Mexica florebat, studiisque ignobilis otii
 Creverat, imperio pollens, atque arte recenti :
 Fortunata nimis, si nulla procacibus unquam
 Insultasset aquis vetiti ratis impia ponti ;
 Nullus Atlantiacos penetrasset navita fluctus !
 Nequidquam : quoniam mortalia corda cœgit,
 Frænorum impatiens, atque aversata quietis,
 Vis animi, stimuli que acres ; quoniam impulit auri
 Importuna sitis, nec habendi explenda libido :

Ergo non cæci minitanti murmura cœli
 Compressere Virum,² aut toties concussa rebelli
 Cymba metu, mediisque sedens Discordia transtris ;
 Aut malesuada Fames, et plurima mortis imago :
 Néc præceps Aquilo, nec conjuratus euntem
 Terruit Oceanus, quin claustra obstantia mundi
 Rumperet, ignotisque lubens se traderet undis :
 O ! quanta exiguae tum credita fata carinae,
 Regnorumque vices, divisique orbis origo !

Hinc olim spoliatus honos, hinc, Mexica, regni
 Lapsa fuit Fortuna tui ; quo tempore primum
 Spectasti nitidis æquor candescere velis,
 Litora que Hispanas devota accedere classes :
 Quas, cursu in medio, quam debuit Auster iniquis
 Illisisse vadis, subitave egisse procella
 Præcipites, scelerum vindex, et fraudis avaræ !
 At rudis a patriis descendens incola sylvis
 Prodigium stupet, et subeuntes ostia nautas—
 Qui fuerint ; quæ vasta³ volens pernicibus alis
 Per fluctus tulerit moles ; unde humida mundi
 Mœnia transierint ; aut quas via tendat in oras.
 Talia, collecta stipantes litora turba,
 Inter se rogitant ; dum vasto pondere naves,
 Dum dubios vultus, et plusquam humana⁴ virorum
 Corpora mirantur : Pavor exultantia pulsât
 Pectora ; et obtutu tacito circum omnia pendet ;
 Incerti Genios, ac numina magna locorum,

¹ "All the Americans, except Mexicans and Peruvians, when first discovered, were in the state of savages." Rob. vol. i. p. 26.

² Virum, sc. Columbum.

³ "The vast machines in which they had traversed the ocean seemed to them (the natives) to move upon the waters with wings." Rob. vol. i. p. 129.

⁴ "They (the natives) began to respect their new guests as a superior order of beings, and concluded that they were the children of the sun, who had descended to visit the earth." Rob. vol. i. p. 129.

Au maris immensi prolem, Solisne nepotes
Esse putent : tantum ore jubar ; sic candida flamma
Membra nitent ; tanti rutilis e crinibus ignes
Collucet : Quid non mortales improba suavit
Religio ? En ! studiis, quæ cuique est copia, læti
Dona ferunt, totaque Deos venerantur arena ;
Securusque adeo sati, Rex ipse benigno
Excipit hospitio, et largos instaurat honores.

Nec minus interea ignotas in litore formas,
Et fuscis æstu vultus, distinctaque plumis
Cingula mirantur nautæ ; mirantur ut auro
Resplendent pharetræ, crines nodantur in aurum,
“ Et picturatas auri subtemine vestes.”
Continuo læti properant exire, locosque
Explorare novos, faciemque ediscere terræ ;
Qui populi mores, quo fertilis ubere campus.
Tum quanta attonitos sensus, atque ebria visu
Lumina percussit species !

Tu, Terra, recessus
Da mihi vestigare tuos, da vallium apricas
Pandere divitias—vere aurea prata perenni—
Et fluvios montesque sequi ; dum Pieris una
Subter odoratis spargit vestigia sertis.
Namque olim Aonias te nescivisse sorores,
Te silvisse piget. Biferi quid gloria Pæsti,
Quid foret Eurotas, quid, quamvis pinguis Baccho,
Ismara, et injussas fundentia Gargara messes,
Mexica, si fueras, fuerant et si tibi Musæ ?
Hic Venus Idaliæ, hic Cynthius posuisset Apollo,
Hic oleam Pallas, Moriaque² umbracula sylvæ,
Cecropiasque arces ; hic fortunata fuissent
Tempe cum Satyris,³ et Nysigena Sileno.
Flumina quid referam, quibus ipse assurgeret, olim
Fluviorum rex, Eridanus, veloxque refusus
Cederet Ister aquis ? tanto reboantia longe
Arva premunt pelago ! sic auro et turbida gemmis
Naiadum sub sole micant ! dat euntibus ingens
Sylvæ locum, et ponto Tethys fugit ipsa retorto.
An memorem tantos, capita immortalia, montes,

¹ Conf. Pope, *Wind. For.* v. 402. Gray, “feather-cinctured chiefs.”—*Rob. Hist. Am.* ii. 266. “Cortes and his officers viewed with admiration the various manufactures of the country; cotton stuffs of such delicate texture as to resemble silk, pictures formed with feathers of different colours,” &c. &c. •

² Vide Soph. *Æd. Col.* v. 704. (ed. Elm.) ὁ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἄλλος λυγρὸν τὸν Μοριῶν Διὸς, ἢ ὁ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνα. Brunck. *Arist. Nub.* 1005.

³ Conf. Catull. *Carm.* lxiv. 253.

Bruma, tuos thalamos? Sæclorum oblivâ circum—
 Infra anni solisque viæ—Nix incubat æternum
 Arce sedens: non sic cœlo stetit ardua moles,
 Quum Fratrum indefessa cohors involveret Ossam
 Pelio, atque Ossæ vastum accumularet Olympon.

Quod superest, quicquid ¹ Saturnia regna beavit,
 Quicquid et Elysias—vatum aurea somnia—valles,
 Hic vera specie, vivisque coloribus opplet
 Dextera Naturæ præsentior; ipsa meatu
 Insinuat sese tacito, magnusque movetur
 Spiritus, et magicâ contingit cuncta lepore.
 Tum paribus, si vera fides, gens ipsa vigeat
 Ingeniis; quibus unde vetus nascatur origo,
 Scire nefas; ² quanquam vitæ sincera voluptas,
 Et sine labe dies, et morum gratia simplex,
 Prodit Hyperboream ³ stirpem, generisque parentes.
 Hinc non ulla animos delibat cura quietos;
 Nec poterat quemquam obscœni pœllacia nummi
 Decipere in fraudem, quamvis malè prodiga tellus
 Larga auro flueret, gazaque in damna reposta.

O! qui me rapiat, qua formosissima Vallis ⁴
 Panditur, et centum gremio complectitur urbes;
 Ipsa, velut Nymphas inter Dictynna sorores,
 In medio, longe ante alias splendore refulgens,
 Regina ⁵ erigitur, quam circumfusa coerceat
 Vasti zona lacus; hinc propugnacula bello;
 Hinc ⁶ pacis decus: En! fluitantes gurgite sylvæ,
 Et passim vitreis librati in fluctibus horti!
 Quot lympa ore refert flores, ubi dædala subter

¹ "That state of primeval simplicity, which was known in our continent only by the fanciful descriptions of the poets, really existed in the other." Rob. Am.

² After bringing forward the various conjectures on this subject, Robertson gives it as his opinion, that Mexico was originally peopled by tribes who descended from the north, having most probably crossed over from Asia, by what is now called "Bhering's Straits."

³ Hyperboream. De Hyperborea felicitate vide Æsch. Choeph. 367.

ταῦτα μὲν, ὡς καὶ, κρισίονα χρυσῶν,
 μεγάλῃς δὲ τύχῃς καὶ Ἱπερβοριῶν
 μισθὸν φρονίῳ.

Pompon. Mel. viii. 5. "Dutius quam ulli mortalium et beatius vivunt."
 Pind. Pyth. x. 57. Olymp. iii. et ibid. Schol.

⁴ Vallis. The vale of Mexico, containing forty cities.

⁵ Regina. "Mexico, the capital of the empire, situate in the middle of a spacious lake, was the noblest monument of American industry." Guthrie, p. 533.

⁶ This alludes to the floating gardens which abounded in the lake, and which the Mexicans constructed of a very extraordinary size.

Scena natat ! pendent alni, tremulisque salicta
Frondebibus, inversæque relucet purpura vitis.
At circum innumerae volucres, ¹ exilia sæcla,
Exultim canere, et vario trepidare volatu,
Deliciæ nemorum ; dum versicoloribus alis
Fluctuat, et tenui cælum strepit omne susurro ;
Seu rostris summos examina devia flores,
More apium, libant, sive irrequietas per auras
Ludunt, melle mero mentes percussa tenellas.

Hei mihi ! Naturæ quoniam purissima templa
Incesti violant homines, manibusque cruentis
Effigiem Divæ, et sacrata altaria fœdant !
Hei mihi ! quod valles, choreis et amoribus aptæ,
Miscentur Belli Furiis ; nemorumque piorum
Cara pudicitia, castisque crepuscula Nymphis,
Armorum fragor, et matrum lamenta fatigant !

At tibi pro scelere immani, pro talibus ausis,
Numina mercedem meritam, Dux ² improbe, solvant,
Et dignas glomerent iras, si dia quid usquam est
Justitia, et cœli rector mortalia curat ;
Irrita nec rutila molitur fulmina dextra !

Per libertatis cineres, et fortia frustra
Pectora, per Terræ lacrymas non digna ferentis,
Fas caput in pocuas damuatum exposcere ; Iberum
Fas cæcum scelus, et turpes ³ odisse triumphos.
Jam vero, fraudis tantæ gens inscia, tectis,
Excepit sociis ultro, fremituque per urbem
Prosequitur, jungitque manus, dapibusque parâis
Convivas adhibet : juvat, inter pocula, pictis
Ostentare patrum famamque et fata tabellis.⁴
Ast illi interea, meritis pro talibus, atras
Insidias clademque parant, et sanguine sacrum
Polluere hospitium, et pacem miscere duello.

Dignum quinetiam tali fuit hospite sævis
Regem ⁵ ipsum tentare dolis. Proh ! prodiga culpæ
Pectora, inauditumque nefas ! Rex ipse, suorum
Proditor, in fraudes discet jurare, patique
Ereptos ultro fasces, vitamque coactus

¹ Humming-birds.

² Cortes.

³ "In Mexico the progress of the Spanish arms is marked with blood, and with deeds so atrocious as disgrace the enterprising valor that conducted them to success." Rob. vol. iii. p. 90.

⁴ The hieroglyphical paintings of the Mexicans are well known to have been the only historical records which they possessed.

⁵ The manner in which Cortes seized Montezuma in his own palace, and endeavored to make him the instrument for the subjugation of his own people, is here alluded to.

Indecorem patriæ pro libertate pacisci ?
 Scilicet haud satis est tenebris et carcere clauso
 Grandævum fœdare caput, canisque capillis
 Sparsum humerum, et dura volem incurvare catena.
 Nunc, imploranti similis, vaga lumina tollit
 Cum gemitu ; Virtus nunc indignata, Pudorque
 Præcipites redeunt, animique in utrumque parati,
 Aut patriam servare, aut non superesse cadenti.

Jam tandem Hispanas peritura expalluit artes
 Mexica, et in mediis agnovit mœnibus hostem :
 Nec mora ; Terrori cædes immittit habenas,
 Et Belli furor, et gemitus, tractaque catenæ
 Audiri: Quid prisca fides, quid nescia falsi
 Vita juvat ? Fatis frustra certamen iniquis
 Pars movet, ignotæque lacessit fulmina pugnae,
 Pro patria moriens : Miseri ! ¹ quos aurea numquam
 Excipiet Solis domus, et promissa piorum
 Concilia heroum : Frustra pars tendit amorem
 Cum prece, jurataque cadit cruor hospitis ara.
 Sicut ubi ingratas hederas amplexibus ilex
 Excipit, et fida foliorum protegit umbra,
 Ille arctos furtim sinuant in cortice nodos,
 Et truncum rigido morsu pascuntur ; at ipsa
 Serius heu ! rapis creptos mœret honores,
 Languentesque comas, siccataque brachia succo.

Atqui non adeo tantas tam impune per urbem
 Edebant strages ; neque sic sine vindice cessit
 Mexica. Vos, ² aræ, vos, orgia lurida, testor,
 Humanasque epulas, votivo ubi sanguine sævi
 Templâ fluunt nocturna Dei, ³ vivaque calescit
 Cæde pavementum, atque inimicis ossibus albet.
 At procul interea, lûnæ sub luce maligna,
 Admotos igni socios agnoscit Iberus, ⁴
 Ardentemque pyram : cultrâs videt inde parari,
 Solemnemque trahi pompas, rutilasque choreis
 Collucere faces ; gemitusque audisse suorum

¹ The Mexicans believed that soldiers who died in battle went to the house of the sun to lead a life of delight.

² "Every captive taken in battle was brought to the temple, was devoted as a victim to the Deity, with rites no less solemn than cruel." Rob. vol. iii. p. 335.—³ "After which the warrior, by whose prowess the prisoner had been seized, feasted on the body." Ib.

⁴ "Dei, Mexitli, from whom the country is said to have been named.

⁵ "He (Cortes) heard the piteous lamentations of his soldiers, whom the Mexicans having taken alive, were sacrificing in triumph to the God of war." Rob. vol. iii. p. 30. These sanguinary rites always took place in the night.

Dicitur, ut, ignibus junctis altaria circum,
In¹ sua vix trepido præludunt funera gressu.

Sic demum cecidit, multos dominata per annos,
Mexica, et imperiis ingloria cessit, Iberis,
Externique jugo domini: fugit omnis ab ora
Exsul honos; subeunt fraudes, et avara libido.
Sicut² ubi sævo succiditur hortus aratro,
Purpurei intereunt flores, at mæsta cicuta
Nascitur, et campo steriles dominantur avenæ.
Heu! patria infelix, cujus ditissima tellus.
Exitio fuit! Ipsa eadem prægnantia leto
Viscera, et abruptis barathrum sublustræ metallis
Pandit³ in excidium populi; sævosque labores,
Verberaque, et longos peperit sine solibus annos.
Hinc artus resides, disinctaque in otia natos,
Corripuere cohors morborum; hinc flebile murmur
Ingruit, et pæcæ penitus gemuere fodinæ.
Ast, opere in medio, multi singultibus imis.
Linquebant dulces animas, interve flagella
Fregit corpoream vita indignata catenam:
Tum⁴ procul impastæ projecta cadavera circum
Invigilant tigres, obscænarumque volucrum
Tetra super legio ferali remigat ala.

Audin' ? ut insonuit cælum: non murmura luctus
Amplius, aut avium clangor; sed clara remugit
Buccina, et excussæ læto stridore catenæ.
Ergo gens sævos, post sæcula longa, tyrannos
Rejicit impatiens, patrumque ulciscitur umbras;
Ergo iterum dulci Libertas numine fontem
Restinxit lacrymarum, instauravitque triumphos;
Pone sequens cælo niveis Concordia pennis
Plaudit; et annorum incepit jam purior ordo:
Securos veluti cum rauca per æquora nidos
Alcyones posuere, fugantur carmine nubes,
Suave micant fluctus, et detumescere procellæ.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,

CH. CH.

¹ They were made to dance round the altars in honor of the God, to whom they were about to be sacrificed.

² "From the continual wars and civil dissensions, nothing was now seen but poverty and desolation, where fertility and opulence before abounded." Supp. Enc. Brit.

³ The mortality among the Mexicans, occasioned by their being compelled to dig in the mines, is said to have been almost incredible.

⁴ "Torribio affirms that the country round several of the mines was covered with dead bodies; and so many voracious birds hovered about for their prey, that the air was darkened with their flight." Rob. vol. iv. p. 324.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XLVII.

ΙΑΚΩΒΑΚΗ ΡΙΖΟΤ ΤΟΤ ΝΕΡΟΤΛΟΤ

Εἰς ἑαυτόν.

Ποῦ εἶν' ἐκεῖνος ὁ καιρὸς ὅταν κ' ἐγὼ εὐδαίμων
 ἀπ' αὐρας βοηθούμενος τῶν εὐμενῶν ἀνέμων,
 ἀκύμαντον διέπλεα τὸ πέλαγος τοῦ βίου,
 καὶ εἰς τοὺς κόλπους ἔμβαινα λιμένος γαληνίου!
 λιμὴν ἦτον ὁ οἶκός μου· 'ς ἐκεῖνον καθ' ἡμέραν,
 συμπαίζων μὲ τὰ τέκνα μου, περίπαιζα τὴν σφαῖραν·
 συμπάρεδρον 'ς τὴν τράπεζαν λαμβάνων τὴν ὑγείαν,
 τὴν ἀπαλὴν τῶν ἔτρεφα κ' ἀθώαν ἡλικίαν.

Ἄλλ' ὦ πατρίς! ὦ ὄνομα παμφίλτατον καὶ θεῖον!
 φεῦ! σὲ προφέρω σήμερον μετὰ πικρῶν δακρύων!
 ὦ γλυκυτάτῃ μου πατρίς! τὰ τέκνα σου καθένα
 Ὅποταν σὺ προσκάλεσες, σὺ μ' ἔκραξες κ' ἐμένα.
 Τί τέκνον σου εἰλικρινὲς μ' Ἑλληνικὴν καρδίαν,
 πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν σου ἐμελλε νὰ μὲν' εἰς ληθαργίαν;

Διέβην γῆν τὴν εὐάνδρον τῆς ἄνω Γερμανίας,
 τὴν γῆν τὴν φίλην τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας.
 Διῆλθα τὴν καλλίλιμνον γενναίαν· Ἑλβετίαν,
 Ἑλλήνων εὐεργέτριαν μὲ μεγαλοψυχίαν.
 Ἐθαύμασα κ' ἠγάπησα τὴν σάφρονα Γενέβην,
 καὶ, εὐχθεὶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, τὰς Ἀλπεὶς ὑπερέβην
 κατέβην 'ς τὰ ἡλύσια Ἰταλικά πεδία·
 φιλομμειδῆς, φιλόξενος μ' ἐδέχθ' ἡ Τυρρηνία.
 Τὰς θέσεις τὰς ποιητικὰς, τὰ ἄλση τῆς, τοὺς κήπους,
 ὅπου ἔμβαινει ὁ χειμὼν μὲ σέβας καὶ βραδύπους,
 τὰ ἴθα· πλην, ἀλλοίμονον! παυσίλυπα πρὸς ἄλλους
 'ς ἐμένα λύπας γέννησαν καὶ στεναγμοὺς μεγάλους.

Ἐνίστε πλανώμενος 'ς τὴν παραθαλασσίαν,
 μὴν ἔχων ἄλλον σύντροφον παρὰ τὴν ἀθυμίαν,
 ὅποταν πλοῖα ἔβλαπα τὴν θάλασσαν νὰ σχίζουν,
 "μακάριοι," ἐφώναξα, "ὅπόσῃ ἀρμενίζουν!
 ποτε, πτηνὰ θαλάσσια, νὰ φέρατ' ἐμένα
 μὲ τὰς λευκάς σας πτέρυγας 'ς τῆς Τόρας τὸν λιμένα!"

Πρὸ ἡμερῶν πλὴν νῦν, ἀπὸ ἀτμῶν πληθύρας
 ἐργασίμων, ἐβόησαν καὶ ἐξήντα ὥρας . . .

Μετὰ τὴν παῦσιν τῆς βροχῆς, ἐγὼ κ' ἕνας μευ φίλος,
 ἄργα περιπατούσαμεν 'ς τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ χεῖλος.
 Ἐκεῖ παρέτηρήσαμεν, μετὰ φρυγάνων ἄλλων,
 κ' ἕνα παρασυρόμενον κορμὸν δρυὸς μεγάλον.
 Στραφεῖς τότε 'ς τὸν φίλον μου. "Ἴδε," τὸν εἶπα, "κείνην
 τὴν δρῦν, πῶς παραφέρεται 'ς τὴν ποταμίαν δίνην.
 Ἦτον κ' αὐτὴ πυκνόφυλλος· μὲ κλῶνας πολλοὺς πρώην,
 μὲ τὴν σκιὰν τῆς δρύσιζε τὴν ὑποκάτω χλόην·
 'ς τοὺς κλάδους τῆς λιθύφθογγα πτηνὰ ἐκελαδοῦσαν·
 'ς τὴν ρίζαν τῆς τὰς σύριγγας ποιμένες ἐφυστοῦσαν·
 ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐξερρίζωσε τῆς καταιγίδος βία,
 'ς τὸν Ἄρνον τὴν ἐκρήμισε, καὶ σύρετ' ἡ ἀθλία.
 Μὲ τοῦτον, φίλε, τὸν κορμὸν κ' ἐγὼ παρομοιώθην,
 ἀφ' οὗ ἀπὸ τὸν οἶχόν μου χωρίσθην κ' ἐμονώθην."

In the 523rd line of the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, I wonder it never occurred to any one to read, instead of *καπαγώνιος*, καὶ *παιώνιος*, which gives an undoubted and more intelligible sense. I might bring many reasons for this alteration, but I think it may be left to be tried by its own merits.

W. S.

St. John's, Camb.

On the Arabic terms HORAM and HARAM.

FROM time immemorial the Arabic word *Haram* has been used by European authors, in their accounts or descriptions of Mohammedan countries, to signify a palace or residence where Mohammedan women are kept by sultans and princes: this term, however, in this sense, is unintelligible or misapplied. The first person who uses this erroneous term is *D'Herbelot*, in his *Dictionnaire Oriental*; and as it has been the custom for lexicographers and compilers of dictionaries to extract and to copy from one another, seldom deviating from the beaten path, this misapplied word has become, among European writers, of general use, to signify a palace or residence for ladies of Mohammedan princes: but in using the word *Haram*, they have chosen a term whose signification is diametrically opposite to that which it is intended to represent; for the fact is, that *Haram* signifies an unlawful place; *Harami*, a rogue or rascal, a natural son; *B'led el harem*, a country of wicked people or of natural children: consequently the word *Haram* is a very ill-chosen term, to signify a sultana's palace or residence for the wives of Mohammedan princes. Whether this error has originated with *D'Herbelot*, or with some oriental author who

preceded him, I shall not stop here to inquire; but I shall proceed to say, that *Horam* is the Arabic term used in all Arabian countries to signify a scraglio or palace for wives and ladies of Mohammedan princes: the word *Horam* signifies also a respected or sacred place; a sanctuary is a *Horam*.

The *Horam* of the Emperor of Morocco, Muley Ismael, at Mekines,¹ was held so sacred during the life of that amorous prince, that no one dared approach even the walls of that respected habitation under pain of being shot by the sentinels.

Those virgins with large black eyes, or the fancied nymphs of paradise, according to the Mohammedan creed, are called *El Hory*.

Noble-minded or high-born man, *Rajel-Horr*.

Noble-minded or noble-born woman, *Murrah-Horrah*.

A beautiful woman (allegorical term), *Hory*.

A house or palace for oriental women, *HORAM*.

This being premised, I think every one will agree that the correct term for a palace or residence for the wives and ladies of Mohammedan sultans and princes is *Horam* and not *Haram*, as it has heretofore been called by European writers on Mohammedan and Oriental countries.

JAMES GREY JACKSON.

PROLOGUE

TO THE ADELPHI:

PERFORMED AT WESTMINSTER SCHOOL, DEC. 1828.

SALVETE, nostro benevoli spectaculo,
 Quod more jamdudum apparamus annuo:
 Nec ista quenquam offendat intermissio;
 Per quam doloris facta testis publici
 Terentiana Musa siluit—Quippe erat
 Sacrata causa luctus, atque cuilibet
 Multum optanda; nostro at plurimum choro,
 Cujus solebat interesse fabulis
 Desideratus Ille Princeps—Floruit,
 Longumque floreat Scholæ hæc regio
 Ornata titulo, et regio digna, auspice—
 Sed si quid emeretur alma comitas,

¹ See a description of this *Horam* in Jackson's Account of Morocco, second or third edition, p. 88.

Et cura nostrî, amorque perpetuus, Tibi,
Frederice, quando ullum reperiemus parem!

At ite severis immorando casibus
Ducantur horæ, quas levis solet sibi
Thalia vindicare, cessent nœniæ;
Verum in memoriâ penitus insideat Ducis
Nomen, beneficia, atque laudes mortui.

Jam nunc, Elizæ ut institutum postulat,
Ad ficta nos convertimus, namque annuus
Mos hicce regiâ superbit vindice;
Nec nomine uno nifitur Comœdia,
Quæ nunc agenda est. Nempe vos Terentius,
Elizæ, Fredericus monent, ut comitèr
Dignemini aures applicare fabulæ:
Et vestra non alio modo pueritia
(Ni fallor) acta, faciat ut puerilibus
Sit benigni et propitii conatibus:
Non pauca quippe nos gravant etiam insuper
Incommoda: Æschinus, Syrus, Geta, Ilegio,
Et Ctesipho veniam sibi omnes impetrent,
Actoribus enim substitutis utimur.

EPILOGUE.

M. Canthara! non redit a vicino Sostrata Bazaar;

Nec qui advorsum ierant conspicio famulos.

Ah! verè hoc dicunt, si connubialia vincula

In te suscipias multa necesse feras:

Jurgia, blanditias, verba aspera, verba jocosa,

Innumeros sumptus multiplicesque moras.

Sed video uxorem—mea lux! mea Sostrata! salve!

Tandem ades. *S.* Ah! mi vir, non potui citius—

Demea mox aderit, qui rem tibi nunciet omnem:

Ipsa quidem hæc eni paucula, bella tamen.

M. Nec chara, ut spero. *S.* Quidnam scelus excidit ore,

Stulte marite, tuo? Maximi erant pretii—

Venditio fit nempe Poetæ pauperis ergo,

Qui, nisi verborum copiam, habet nihilum.

Emisse et magni virtus est—maxima virtus.

M. Judice me, virtus incipit hæcce domi.

Sed quisnam huc properat? Nisi me mea lumina fallunt,

Demea nos rapidis passibus aggreditur—

Demea, quid properas? Animam recipe. *D.* Hei mihi! prorsus—

M. Quidnam est hoc prorsus? Quid trepidas? *D.* Perii:

Actum est—tentavi nimirum affabilis esse,

Et malè processit—nam tria verba decem

Stabant aureolis—Verùm accipe, Micio, lintrem

Pulchellum, mihi quein vendidit ista Venus.

Syr. Vah! quando rursus festiva illuxerit hora,

Hoc sit connubii pignus houorque tui.

M. Scilicet in portu jam navigo; at, obsecro, narra

Omnem rem. *D.* Meminisse horreo, at incipiam.

Postquam te in solido rursus, Soror alma, locâssem,

Collectas volui visere delicias.

Dum tamen errabam, consexi forte puellam

Formâ—*M.* Pulchrâ nempe. *D.* Eximia; atque oculis

Tam nitidis, magnis, et claris, ut nil supra—

Huic dixi, ut decuit (væ mihi! nam perii)

Sed dixi, ut decuit, "Salve, formosa puella."

Hæc contrâ, "Quid emes, o bonæ vir, quid emes?"

Emi ergo lintrem—et perdam post omnia uaulum,

Linter enim aureolis constitit iste decem.

M. Aureolisne decem? *D.* Sanè, mi Micio, sanè;

Nam virtutis erat restituisse nihil.

Displicuere vices Divis, reliquumque petenti,

Vox erat hæc Veneris "nil ego restituo."

S. Et meritò, Frater: quærenda pecunia primùm—

Virtus—*D.* Verbum odi, Sostrata—quid latet hic?

Syr. Oh Domine! Iggentem sumptum ne quære tuorum,

Nec vir adire velis non adeunda viro!

Vindicat hæcce sibi nova nupta. *D.* Anne omnia? *Syr.* Verè

Omnia; pars minima est nostra puella sui.

S. Vos isthæc auferte intrò; tu tangere noli,

Demea. *D.* Ne sævi, Sôstrato, tantòpere!

Gratiam, uti par est, referam; ascribique Dearum

Valdè sollicitis te faciam ordinibus.

S. O utinam facias! *M.* Noli, mea Sostrata, noli,

Divarum istarum te sociare choro.

S. Hu! nova religio te incessit, chare marite,

Nunc ultra pius es Presbyter. *M.* Unde patet?

S. Artem damnasti, quam, si vis credere famæ,

Emunctarum omnis copia narium amat.

Hæc vespertinus, necnon et matutinus

Rhetor sopitum concitat arte gregem.

Novit Ioannem nostra, ars compescere Taurum,

Et patos Patriet non sinit esse feros.

Non aliâ in chartis splendent benefacta diurnis,

Non aliâ patriæ sat Priamoque datum.

M. Sat patriæ Priamoque nocet. Fallacia, fucus,

Præcessent causam dedecorare sacram!

Sentis jamdudum (neque enim sunt omnia ficta)

Quam purus matrum corda gubernet amor;

Vidisti timentem fratri arridere sororem,

Et nōsti qualis quantaque cura patrum.
 Ex his exemplum sumas pietatis, et ista
 Æqua homini virtus sit, nec iniqua Deo.
 S. Quin fiat ! Japa nunc redit ad se Sostrata, curis
 Digna tuis iterum, nomine digna suo.
 Jactari cessans, simulare, et fallere, virtus
 Re verâ incipiat nostra vigere domi.

NOTICE OF

VIGER'S GREEK IDIOMS, Abridged and
 Translated into English from PROFESSOR HER-
 MANN'S last edition, with Original Notes. By the
 Rev. JOHN SEAGER, B.A. Rector of Welch Bick-
 nor, Monmouthshire. London, 1828. Pr. 9s. 6d.
 pp. 258. 8vo. Longman.

WE congratulate schoolmasters and students on the publica-
 tion of this book, which presents a good manual for their pur-
 pose. The original work is too expensive and too voluminous
 for the generality of students, and perhaps too troublesome for
 the preceptor to consult. Mr. Seager is a ripe and good scho-
 lar, and what he undertakes will be done well. He is a man
 of reflection, as well as of learning; zealous and persevering in
 the cause of literature; free from critical asperity and malignity;
 as the readers of our *Journal* have had frequent opportunities
 of observing.

We have remarked with satisfaction that Mr. Seager designs
 to publish similar abridgments of '*Høgeveen on the Particles*,'
 '*Bos on the Ellipses*,' and '*Hermann on the Metres of the
 Greek language*.' Of the last-named work Hermann himself
 has published an abridgment.

Mr. Seager's Preface, which is short, will sufficiently explain
 the nature of the work now offered to the public notice:—

The utility of Viger's¹ Treatise on the principal idioms of the Greek language is
 well known, and fully justifies his recommendation of a repeated perusal of the
 work by all who are desirous of entering with advantage on the study of the
 Greek authors. In that work he has collected and explained, on a plan of arrange-
 ment for the most part practically convenient, a multitude of phrases remarkable

¹ Or, with the Latin termination with which his name, although he was a native
 of Rouen, has been dignified, *Vigerus*'s.

for their peculiarity or elegance. Many of these are very difficult, and are interpreted in no other book, or in none accessible to the generality of students, or in none so fully, clearly, and correctly. It is no wonder, therefore, that the work should have continued in general use ever since its first publication.¹ To say nothing of the testimony of others, Professor Hermann declares² it to have been deservedly esteemed most useful; and indeed its value is sufficiently attested by the comments of learned men; of Reizius, Hoogveen, Zeunius, Schæfer, and lastly, of that most profound and acute critic, Professor Hermann himself.

The first who published an edition of Viger with notes was Hoogveen. Zeunius followed him, and added his own annotations to Hoogveen's. Afterwards Hermann enriched his editions with the notes not only of Hoogveen, and Zeunius, and with a few which had been written by Reizius and by Schæfer³ in the margins of their copies of Viger, but with very copious and important notes of his own. By all these additions to the original work, a body of Greek learning has been formed of the greatest moment to those who are desirous of attaining a thorough knowledge of that justly admired language, which it is calculated to illustrate. But many are deprived of the benefit to be derived from the book, not only by an inadequate acquaintance with the Latin language, in which it is written, but by the bulk and price of it in its improved condition. It was considered, therefore, that an abridgment in English of the last edition of Viger might prove highly beneficial.

This I have endeavored to effect without any sacrifice of useful matter, by embodying both the text and notes in the formation of a new text, retaining every thing really valuable, and rejecting all that is manifestly erroneous and useless.

The general arrangement of Viger, however objectionable in some respects, has been unavoidably preserved, together with his division into Chapters, Sections, and Rules, as he calls his lowest subdivisions. The substance, indeed, of the notes appended in the original to each rule being here incorporated with the rule itself, the length of the rules is necessarily very unequal; because many and long notes are often in the original referred to a long rule, while a short rule is often left without any annotation at all; but the facility of reference and comparison afforded by this method; will, it is hoped, overbalance any seeming inconvenience.

Many of the definitions or descriptions which precede the examples of idioms in the original, are clumsy and inartificial; inapplicable to the idioms treated of, or encumbered with unessential particulars; often inadequate to the comprehension of all the examples following them, and often, on the other hand, too loose to apply peculiarly and exclusively to the idiom introduced by them. I have ventured, therefore, to remodel them in so many instances, that I can give only this general advertisement of such alterations.

The passages cited are next to be mentioned. Of passages equally adapted to the exemplification of an idiom, I have always preferred such as are given on good authority to such as appear without any name either in the text or notes; and I have generally copied, with the omission sometimes of parts irrelevant to the idiom under consideration, all that are necessary to be immediately seen for the elucidation of that idiom; referring to all others of any use, especially to such as are taken from books, where they may be easily and readily found. In many instances mere references, instead of passages, are given in the original: the whole of these, I believe, both in the text and notes, have been transferred into this abridgment. They may perhaps appear very numerous; but for the thorough understanding of an idiom, it is often desirable to contemplate it in different situations, and in all its shades of variation; and in a large number of references there is a chance that some at least of the books referred to may be accessible to every reader.

¹ The edition printed at Paris in 1644.

² *De idiomatis.*

³ The notes of Reizius are judicious and useful; but those of that able scholar Schæfer, which Hermann found of any use, are so very few, that they have left no impression on my mind with regard to their value.

In translating the examples, I have not contented myself with the sense which words may possibly admit when considered *abstractedly*; but of all the passages which I remembered, or to which I was able to refer, I have endeavored to give that interpretation which the tenor of the context requires. The limits assigned to the work obliged me in many instances to render the idiomatical words only; and where the meaning is very obvious, and is moreover contained in an exposition preceding the citation of examples, any further interpretation has sometimes been judged needless. Translation indeed, properly so called, was not always possible. Various modifications, transitions, and connexions of thought are expressed in Greek by words to which there are none precisely equivalent in languages formed by nations of less acuteness and refinement.

Such is the mode of proceeding which appeared to me the most eligible with regard to the materials furnished by the original. In the hope of increasing their utility, I have offered some additions and observations of my own; but the want of room obliged me to leave many things unaltered and unnoticed, the propriety of which appeared to me, to say the least, very questionable.

They who are thoroughly acquainted with the last editions of Viger need not be told that this Abridgment has been a work of much difficulty and perplexity; and therefore need scarcely be entreated to regard with indulgence the imperfections which they may discover in it. Any suggestions offered by the really learned for the improvement of it will be gratefully received by the publisher.

In p. 9. Mr. Seager quotes Soph. Antig. 567.

Ἄλλ' ἢδε μέντοι μὴ λέγ'· οὐ γάρ ἐστ' ἔτι.

In the note he conjectures the true reading to be,

Ἄλλ' ἢδε μέν σοι μηδέν· οὐ γάρ ἐστ' ἔτι.

P. 107.—“I believe that all the passages in which φθάνειν occurs, may be explained by its primary meaning of anticipation or celerity: thus, when in Eurip. (Hæc. 720.) the servant says to Iolaus, ὕπλων μὲν ἦδη τήνδ' ὁρᾷς πάντευχλαν. φθάνεις δ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν τοῖσδε συγκρήπτων δέμας, he means to inform him that he cannot arm himself more quickly than the exigence requires; that all his despatch cannot outstrip the necessity of the occasion. So φυτεύων παῖδας οὐκ ἔρ' ἂν φθάνοις, Eurip. Alcest. 665. you cannot too soon beget other children to cherish your old age and bury you; for as to me, I renounce you. *So in the passage from Xen. οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις λέγων, you cannot forerun my desire of hearing, however quickly you may tell me. And by its signification of celerity may be explained this same phrase when used interrogatively, as in Aristoph. Plut. 874. And when the formula had once become usual in the second and third persons to enjoin or express celerity, it was natural enough that it should be employed in the first person also, to express an intention of doing any thing quickly: thus, ἀλλὰ μέντοι, φάσαι, τὰ γε ἀληθῆ παρήμι, καὶ κελεύω λέγειν. Οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιμι, εἰπὼν τὴν Ἀλκιβιάδην: Plato Sympos. xxxi. 7. I think it therefore unnecessary to adopt the novel supposition of Hermann, that φθάνω is properly *cesso, desino*.”

P. 121.—“Ὁ περιέχων, literally, that which surrounds, clips, embraces, is put for the air or atmosphere; as, δυσκρασίαι τοῦ περιέχοντος, bud temperature of the air: Plut. Alex. So κράσιν τοῦ περιέχοντος, Id. ib. It is here satisfactory to observe the knowledge of Greek shown by most of our newspaper writers, who constantly call the air the surrounding element: though some may be inclined to consider the expression not as a græcism, but as the offspring of that laudable abhorrence of vulgar language, to which we owe, devouring element, for fire; watery element, for water; interesting female, for shoplifter; being launched into eternity, for being hanged; having the vital spark extinguished, for dying, &c. &c.”

P. 148.—“Νῦν and νῦν are used in poetry only, and appear to signify—I. an indivisible point of time, as in Hom. Il. ψ. 485, and ε. 311. at once; instantly.—2. illation: ἦκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι κατὸν βέλος· οἱ δὲ νῦ λαοὶ θῆσκον ἐπασσέτεροι: wherefore the people, &c. Hom. Il. α. 383, σώσον αὐτὸν, (the gold) μὴδ' ἔρα τῶν πλοσίων· preserve it then—: Eurip. Hec. 996. [982. Pors.]—Νῦν, is found in those passages which admit neither of these significations. Eustathius re-

gards it as a mere expletive: but Demetrius Phalereus remarks that such particles are not to be employed like the chippings and rubbish of masons, barely to fill up spaces; and cites an observation of Praxiphanes, (§ 57.) that some of the little words in question used to be employed with such effect as to produce an expression of moaning and lamentation, as in *καὶ νῦν κ' ἀδύρομένοισιν ἔδω φῶς ἡλίου, εἰ μὴ*, &c. [Hom. II. ψ. 554.] This perhaps is a little fanciful; see Hom. Od. ι'. 79. However this may be, it is often much more easy to perceive that the construction would suffer by the absence of a particle, than to define exactly the effect of its presence."

P. 203.—"In barbarous Latin *quia* is used in the same manner as *ὅτι* in Greek. Thus in the vulg. translation of St. Matth. dico vobis, *quia* omnis, qui irascitur fratri suo, reus erit iudicio, v. 22. audistis *quia* dictum est, oculus pro oculo, et dentem pro dente, v. 38. non legistis *quia* qui fecit hominem, ab initio masculum et feminam fecit eos? xix. 4. This use of *quia* led me to observe in the Supplement to Johnson's Dictionary published in 1819, that, *credo quia impossibile est*, which Addison (Freeh. 14.) calls the celebrated rant of an ancient father, may after all mean no more than, *I believe that it is impossible*."

From these quotations the reader will perceive that with the abridgment of the old work is given no small portion of *original* matter.

NOTICES OF FOREIGN WORKS,

WHICH MAY BE HAD OF MESSRS. BLACK AND CO.

Die Etrusker. Vier Bücher von C. O. MÜLLER. Breslau, 1828.

THIS work on "*the Etruscans*" gained the prize of the Royal Academy of Berlin in 1826. The author, Professor Müller, of Göttingen, delayed its publication from a commendable desire to render his work as perfect and complete as possible. It is divided into four books, which are preceded by an introduction on the national affinity of the Etruscans and other Italian races; on the spreading of the Etruscans in Etruria; their power in Upper Italy; on their colonies in Campania and the islands, &c. The *first book* treats of the quality of the Etruscan soil; of its natural produce; of the manufacturing of the raw produce for common use; and of the trade and commerce of the Etruscans. This book ends with a treatise on Etruscan coins.

The *second book* treats of the public and private life of the Etruscans; and explains, in particular chapters, the constitution of the Etruscan confederacy; their military establishment; and ends with an excursus on the sepulchral inscriptions of Etruria. The *third book* treats of the religion and the divination of the Etruscans; and the *fourth*, of their arts and literature, in eight chapters. 1. On the religious games, music, &c. 2. On architecture. 3. On painting and sculpture. 4. On the heroic mythology. 5. On poetry. 6. On the Etruscan writing and signs of numbers. 7. On the calendar and chronology. 8. On the sciences and education among the Etruscans in general.

Our readers must perceive from this table of contents, that Professor Müller has treated his subject in the most comprehensive manner. His ingenious and laborious researches throw a *new* light on a

great number of points in the history of the Etruscans; and the least we can say in praise of him is, that he has won the prize, *longo intervallo*, against all his predecessors who ever wrote on the Etruscans.

Chap. I. on the national affinity of the Etruscans with other Italian races, draws historical inferences from the languages which were spoken in Italy. Niebuhr had remarked that most Latin words which have a reference to a pastoral or agricultural life are of Greek origin, whilst those referring to war and chase are *not* Greek; of the former kind are, *avis, aries, agnus, rus, aper, porcus, equus, ager, silva, arbor, sero, vinum, lac, mel, sal, oleum, lana, glans*: of the latter, *tela, arma, hasta, pilum, gladius, arcus, sagitta*, &c. Niebuhr proved also, that the people of Latium was a mixture of the Siceli and the Aborigines, or Casci; consequently the Greek element of the Latin is derived from the Siceli. Muller shews, in addition, that the words which express the most simple actions are all either Greek, or nearly related to the Greek; as, *eo, sto, sedeo, cubo* (*κείωμαι*), *salio, maneo, video, cerno, cluo, tango, ago, fero, do, fluo, edo*, &c.: the personal pronouns, the pronoun relative, the greater part of the prepositions, the nouns of numbers, are Greek. All the declensions, with a very few exceptions, are taken from the Greek; the declension of the adjectives in the gender, likewise, as well as many parts of the conjugations. The formation of the words is analogous to that in the Greek language. But in the formation of the tenses, the Latin uses *b* and *v* (*amabam, amavi, amabo*), and *r* as *staream, legerem*. Muller goes on to show, that the language of the Osci and the Latin were only dialects: he wishes to infer, that the Aborigines and the Osci, Opici, or Ausones, belonged to the same race of people. It is a striking remark, we confess, that both the Greeks and the Osci put for the Latin *qu* a *p, π*, as *quid* is the Oscan *pit*, and *πῆ quā, ποῖος quātis*, &c. But M. observes himself, that the same exchange of letters takes place in Celtic dialects; and we conceive altogether the evidence concerning the affinity of the Oscan, Sabine, and Umbrian languages with the Latin so defective, that we should hardly venture to draw any inference from it: still more hazardous is the hypothesis, that the Etruscan language might be connected as an extreme link with the Greek language, because we find some analogy between the two people in national costumes and manners. A traveller in the East may remark the same thing of people that speak absolutely different languages.

The name Tyrrheni, which was given to the Etruscan by the Greeks, leads M. to an excursus on the Tyrrheni Pelasgi. He starts a new hypothesis, which is plausible enough. In Lydia, he says, there lived a people called the Torrhebi: their town must have been called Torrha; another dialect may have changed the name into Tyrtha, whence the name Tyrrheni could be regularly derived. Some Pelasgi from Lemnos and Imbros, or other parts of the Aegean, settled on the coast of Lydia, and received from the neighboring country Torrhebia the name Tyrrheni. May be, may not be! It is perilous to draw any historical inference from etymologies of this kind. These Pelasgi-Tyrrheni, continues M., had also a settlement on the promontory Mælea; a branch of them probably settled on the coast of Italy, between the Tiber and the Mæra. The Tyrrheni of Lydia and the Tyrrheni of Etruria, are both mentioned as the inventors of the trumpet and the flute; and why should the Etruscans have adopted more of the Greek

civilisation than the Osci and the Ligurians, if there was no Greek colony in their country? We answer, because they were a seafaring nation, and had much more intercourse with the Greeks of Sicily and Magna Græcia than history tells us. Could not the Tyrrheni of Italy have imported the trumpet and the flute from Asia Minor, and have become thus the inventors of these instruments for Italy? All arguments in favor of an emigration from Lydia seem to us to fail; they had their origin only in the restless ambition of the Greeks to make out national genealogies. The fable of a settlement of the Pelasgi of Thessaly at Cortona, as reported by Hellanicus, may have its foundation, as M. suggests,* in an Etruscan tradition of a native hero, Nanos, buried at Cortona, whom Hellanicus supposed to have been a fugitive from Larissa; and we approve also of his suggestion, that the Pelasgi of Creston were Pelasgi of Κρήστων, on the peninsula of Chalcidice. We must plunge headlong into a labyrinth of possibilities, whenever we attempt, to reconcile the innumerable opinions of the Greek logographi about the Pelasgi, who had already ceased to exist as a nation, when the Greeks began to collect the floating reports concerning them.

In speaking of the boundaries of Etruria towards the country of the Sabines, Falerii is justly mentioned as an Etruscan town. The Romans forced the inhabitants, after having taken their town, which had been situated on a high rock, like most towns of Etruria, to settle in the plain near the Tiber. The new place of settlement was called Æquum Faliscum, whence it was supposed that the Æqui, a distant people, had been mixed up with the population of Falerii; but M. shows, that Æquum Faliscum means only the Falisci in the plain analogous to Æquimelum. The ancient Falerii was situated to the west of Civita Castellana, where there is still a place called Falari; and Æquum Faliscum lay in the plain near the Tiber, between Rome and Otricoli, or in Piano di Borghetto. Virgil's interpretation of Æqui Falisci, the *just* Falisci, is another proof how poets, together with credulous historians, subvert the plain historical truth.

The greatest confusion in history arose from floating traditions, with which no chronological date was connected. Subsequent historians, in making use of these traditions, pitched on different periods, and thus the same historical event appears in different writers at different periods; and after a lapse of time the same event happened to occur in the same writer at different periods twice over. Müller shows this with respect to the origin of the Tuscan Vicus at Rome. Romulus obtains assistance from a Lucumo of Volsinii, Cælius Vibenna, whose companions are settled after his death in the Tuscan Vicus. Another speaks of two brothers, Cælés and Vibenna, companions of Porsenna, who remain behind, and settle in the Tuscan Vicus. Another version is, that the companions of Aruns, after the battle of Aricia, settle on the same spot. A last report is, that Cælius Vibenna came in the time of Tarquinius Priscus to Rome; and that his companion Mastarna, with the remainder of the army, settled at Rome, and became king under the name of Servius Tullius. The last event is, in all probability, the original fact, because the Emperor Claudius read it in the Etruscan annals.

The work abounds in similar ingenious combinations, which frequently draw conviction along with them. Those who have read Niebuhr's Roman History, must read Müller's work on the Etruscans

too, because they tread frequently upon the same ground, and they clash sometimes, as may be expected, on particular points: on the whole, they coincide in the results of their researches, as far as Roman history is concerned. It is impossible to give an adequate notion of the stupendous research which is displayed in Müller's work: this fact accounts for the intense anxiety with which its publication was looked for in Germany.

Sylloge Epigrammatum Græcorum ex Marmoribus et Libris collecta et illustravit F. TH. WELCKER. Editio altera recognita et aucta. Bonnæ, 1828.

This new edition of Greek epigrams has been considerably enlarged. They are divided into three classes. the first contains, *Epigrammata Sepulcralia*, p. 1^a—150; the second, *Epigrammata ἀναθηματικά*, p. 151—226; the third, *Epigrammata Promiscua*, p. 227—282: then follows an *Index Epigrammatum*, p. 283—287; an *Index Verum et Verborum*, p. 288—292; and pp. 293—304. contain *Addenda*. The epigrams of each class are subdivided into those which are taken *ex marmoribus*, and those which are taken *ex libris editis*. The *Sepulcralia* are so arranged, that those of a public character precede those which were set up by private individuals; of the *ἀναθηματικά*, those which refer to the gods, precede those which refer to heroes, magistrates, &c. Under *Promiscua* are classed those epigrams which contain *nuntios*, *monita*, *demonstrationes*, *sententias*, &c. The editor has been supported by liberal contributions from Niebuhr, Boeckh, Osann, Gerhard, Letronne, and especially from Jacobs. Each epigram is accompanied by a critical commentary, which is exceedingly valuable. There are in all 240 epigrams.

A great number of them have never been published before, except perhaps in travels or periodicals.

As a specimen we here insert the inscription found at Olympia, (Boeckh. Corp. Inscr. No. 16. Rose, Inscr. p. 66.) which is thus given by Welcker:

Ἰάπων ὁ Δεινομένεος
καὶ τοὶ Συνακόσιοι
τῇ Διὶ Τυρρῶν' ἀπὸ Κόρας.

Welcker says of Rose, "Boeckhii explicationem a sensu suo detorqueus in eam, quæ vera illius viri sententiæ erat, Locakium etiam incidisse refert." Welcker remarks also on the word Τυρρῶν' (ΤΥΡΑΝ'), "Malim intelligere ipsa κράνη," not as Boeckh and Broenstaed did, ὄπλα, λάφυρα, σκύλα, and he refers to *Albesia*, i. e. *scuta Albensium*, and *Δακωνικά* or Ἀμικλάδες, and to Virg. Cir. 169. "Cognita non teneris pedibus Sicyonia servans." The last verse was allowed by Boeckh to be *paracemicus*: W. adds, "Mihi prioribus etiam modi videntur inesse . . . Anapestici modi adhibiti videntur, quod ex iis quasi resonat gaudium triumphii, cui galeæ capite monumento sunt . . . Immixtus autem in ejusmodi carmine anapæstis iambus ne nimis acriter tuum offendat animum;" and refers to the pæan on Lysander (Plutarch in Lys. 18.), which was thus restored by Hermann:

Τὴν Ἑλλάδος ἀγαθῆας
στραταγὸν ἀπ' εὐρυχώρου
Σπάρτας ὑμνήσομεν, ὦ
ἠ Παιάν.

An iambus here al. ὦ precedes the anapæsts.

The following elegant epitaph has been communicated to Welcker by Pacho, the celebrated traveller in Cyrenaica, who found it in the Ptolemais:

Ι. ΚΘ. ΤΙ. Περρώνιος Καπίτων, ἐτῶν' ΔΚ.
 Βαίὼν σοι τὸ μεταξὺ βίῳ θανάτῳ τ' ἔθηκε
 καὶ τύμβου, Καπίτων, καὶ θαλάμῳ, Τύχῃ.
 νύκτα μίαν ψύσσειν καὶ ἀ[ν]η[λ]έα, τὴν ἄνις ἀδλῶν.
 τὴν δίχα σοι [πα]στῶν, τὴν ἄτερ εἰλαπίρης
 αἰ αἰ τὴν ἐπὶ πέπλα καὶ εἰς ἀμύριστα πεσοῦσα[ν]
 στέμματα καὶ βίβλους εἰς, πρόμῳρε, τέφρην.
 οἱ θρηνοῖσι βοητὸν ὁμήσαν, οἱ τροκελεζέθους
 λαμπάδας ὑστατίου καὶ κενεοῦ λέχους.

JO. NIC. MADRIGII, A.M., *ad Firmam Celeberrimum JO. CASP. ORELLIUM Epistola Critica de Orationum Verrinarum Libris II. extremis emendandis*. Hauniae, 1828.

This letter, addressed to Professor Orelli at Zurich, the learned editor of Cicero's works, informs us that the library at Copenhagen possesses a copy of Gryphius's edition of Cicero's *Orationes*, (Lugd. 1576.) formerly belonging to Joh. Alb. Fabricius, with a number of marginal notes. The book is thus described in Fabricius's Catalogue: "*Ciceronis Orationes*, vol. i. a Joh. Mich. Bruto emendatum. 1572. Act. vi. et vii. in Verriem collata est cum optimo Codice. Bibl. Regie Paris." It appears that those marginal notes actually contain various readings of great value, which render it worth while to publish a new edition of the *Orationes Verrinae*. Grævin was in possession of them, (*Præf. tom. i. p. 3.* where he describes them as '*codicis optimi lectiones*,') although he was negligent enough not to make any use of them. Madrig gives in this letter to Orelli a number of the most important readings, together with his own critical remarks on a variety of passages. In the preface he speaks in terms of reprobation of Goerenz, Moser, Creuzer, and Schütz, as editors of Cicero, but acknowledges the merits of Victorinus, Lambinus, Bentley, Ernesti, Meindorf, Hottinger, &c. On the other hand, Moser, in his edition of *Cic. de Divinatione* just published, complains bitterly of the arrogance of Madrig. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Orelli's edition is highly esteemed in Germany, and universally considered to be the best.

Platonis Timæus. Optimarum nunc editionum textus recognovit, adnotatione continua illustrabat, indice instruxit, AUG. FRID. LINDAU, A.M. Pref. Reg. Gymn. Olsn. Collega. Lipsiæ, 1828.

This edition of *Timæus* is dedicated to Prince Ypsilanti, the father of the Ypsilantis who began the revolution in Walachia and in Greece, "*propter liberalem in patriam e barbaris restitutionem*." Five Paris cods. were collated at the editor's expense, more carefully than it had ever been done before, even Im. Bekker's collation not excepted; the Cod. Raudnicensis, which belongs now to the University library of Breslau, was also made use of. From p. 1 to 176. is given the text with a Latin translation; the Commentary itself occupies 144 pages, and is executed with the greatest care and ingenuity. We refer our readers especially to Comm. p. 42. *ὥστ' ἐν ἐκαστῷ διαστήματι*, and Appendix, p. 139. where the most difficult part of *Timæus* is very ably elucidated.

Archæologie und Kunst. Im Verein mit mehreren Freunden des Alterthums in, Inlande und Auslande in freien Heften herausgegeben von C. A. BOTTIGER. Ersten Bandes erstes Stück. Mit 4 Bildtafeln. Breslau, 1828.

This periodical is devoted to Archaeology and to the ancient works of art, and edited by Bottiger, whose name alone is a sufficient guarantee for the merits of the work. His extensive connexions have enabled him to get contributions from the most distinguished archaeologists of St. Petersburg, Göttingen, Weimar, Berlin, Paris, London, and Vienna. The present Number contains six articles: 1. Dioscorides and Solon. On gems, with the names of the artists, by Kohler of St. Petersburg. 2. The Drudenfoot, or the Pentalfa, by Prof. Lange. 3. On the twenty-seven holy places, the *Loca Argæorum* at Rome, by Prof. Müller of Göttingen. 4. On the first numbers of Prof. Gerhard's plates of ancient works of sculpture, by Prof. Gerhard himself. 5. Hercules the robber of the tripod on monuments of ancient art, and on the supposed Curtina upon them, by Prof. Passow. 6. On the Hermaphrodite Symplegmata, by Prof. Müller. Then follows the correspondence on archaeology, which contains epistolary communications from Prof. Heeren at Göttingen; G. Cattaneo, at Milan; Counsellor Rochdiz, at Leipzig; Professor Seydarth, Dr. Dorow, and James Millingen; and the whole concludes with archaeological Miscellanea. The next number will contain an article from Thomas Hawkins, Esq. at Little Hampton, Sussex.

Professor Müller, on the Hermaphrodite Symplegmata, takes notice of an error which has crept into the "Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum." There a hermaphrodite symplegma is falsely described as the "statue of an intoxicated Faun." A similar symplegma exists in the collection of H. Blundell, Esq. at Lpee, near Liverpool; but in the "Engravings and Etchings of the principal statues, busts, &c. of Blundell's Museum," published 1809, 2 vols. fol., the hermaphrodite has been described as a nymph. These two symplegmata, compared with two others in the collection of Antiques at Dresden, enabled Professor Müller to determine what they are really meant to represent. The letter of Professor Heeren proves, against Dr. Young, the decipherer of the hieroglyphics, that the Egyptian sarcophagus in the British Museum, brought by Belzoni from the Thebais, cannot be the monument of the king Psammuthis. This is shown from a passage of Herodotus, ii. 169. which renders it evident that Psammuthis was buried at Sais. It cannot be even his cenotaph, for the sarcophagus was found in it. According to Heeren's calculation, it might be the sarcophagus of Amenophis II., called Memnon by the Greeks, the seventh king of the eighteenth dynasty in Manethon, anno 1500 before Christ. The letter of M. Millingen is very interesting; it announces that M. Panoika, who has already written a clever work on the island of Samos, is now about illustrating the collection of the Duke de Blacas. M. Raoul Rochette is going to publish the vases of M. Durand and Count Pourtales. M. Millingen expresses a wish that the conciseness of Winckelman and Visconti might be taken as models in works on archaeology; and that the mystical system, too prevalent in the present day, may be relinquished. We do not know what this means; perhaps Professor Cœuzer, at Heidelberg, can tell us.

Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ. Editio emendatior et copiosior, consilio B. G. NIEBUHRII, C. F. instituta, opera ejusdem Niebuhrii, Imp. Bekkeri, L. Schopeni, G. Dindorfii, aliorumque Philologorum parata. Pars XX. Cantacuzenus. Vol. I. Bonnæ, 1828.

The new edition of the Byzantini at Bonn, under the superintendence of Niebuhr, has been successful in Germany beyond expectation; and so anxious is the editor to advance the work rapidly, that the different parts are published separately. At the commencement of this year Part III. was published, and Part XX. has just appeared: the intermediate parts, as well as the following, will be published as soon as they are ready for the press. We cannot see any real inconvenience in this plan of publishing a *Corpus Scriptorum*, when it is left to the option of the subscribers to select any parts they please, and it undoubtedly accelerates the publication of the whole.

Part III. contained Agathias; the present volume, Part XX. contains the first four books of the history of J. Cantacuzenus. The whole history of Cantacuzene will occupy three volumes. The editor, L. Schopen, has given the text of the Paris edition, (3 vols. fol. 1645.) published from a codex belonging to the library of the celebrated Chancellor Segnier. Beneath the text is given the Latin translation Jacobus Pontanus, published at Ingolstadt, 1603. The editor has not had the advantage of any Ms., but was enabled, by means of the translation, to correct the text in several places. This will be still more the case with the latter books of Cantacuzene, on which the Paris editor does not seem to have bestowed the same care as on the first. Gibbon says, with respect to Cantacuzene, "The name and situation of the emperor, John Cantacuzene, might inspire the most lively curiosity. His memoirs of forty years extend from the revolt of the younger Andronicus to his own abdication of the empire; and it is observed that, like Moses and Cæsar, he was the principal actor in the scenes which he describes." The importance of his work for that period of the history of the Byzantine empire may be perceived, from the frequent use which Hammer made of it in his excellent *History of the Ottoman Empire*, of which the first three volumes have already been published at Vienna.

Anecdota Græca. E Codd. Mss. Bibl. Reg. Paris. descriptis L. BACHMANNUS. Vols. I. et II. Lipsiæ, 1828.

Vol. I. contains—Συναγωγή λεξέων χρησίμων, p. 1—422. Λεξικὸν τῆς γραμματικῆς, p. 423—450. Λεξικὸν τοῖς Κάνοσι κατὰ στοιχείων, p. 450—459. Vol. II. Μαξίμου τοῦ Πλανούδη περὶ γραμματικῆς διάλογος, p. 1—101. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ συντάξεως, p. 103—166. Ἰσακίου τοῦ Μονάχου περὶ μέτρων ποιητικῶν, p. 167—196. Λέξεις Ἀλεξάνδρου Λυκόφρονος, p. 197—286. Περί τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων συντάξεως κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, p. 287—304. Ἀλφάβητος ὅπως συντάσσεται δεῖ τὰ ῥήματα, p. 304—315. Περί στιγμῶν, p. 316. Συναγωγή λεξέων χρησίμων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ, p. 317—348. Epimetrum, p. 349—426. At the end are given annotations and indices.

Geographi Græci Minores ex recensione et cum annotatione
 GODOFREDI BERNHARDY. *Dionysius Periegetes Græce et*
Latine, cum Vetus Commentariis et Interpretatione. Pars 1.
 et II. Lipsiæ, 1828.

Professor Bernhardy, at Berlin, has commenced his edition of the Minor Greek Geographers with Dionysius Periegetes. This is undoubtedly the most complete apparatus to Dionys. Periegetes. Vol. I. contains the text, with a Latin translation, which has been most carefully revised; underneath are given the various readings; then follow the *Epistola* and the *Commentaries* of Eustathius; then the *Scholia* and the *Paraphrasis*, which Holsten procured from the royal library at Paris, and that of Nicephorus Blemmidas; it concludes with Rufi Festi Avieni *Descriptio Orbis Tetrae*, and Priscian's *Periegesis*. Vol. II. begins with a *Commentatio de Dionys. Perieget.*; then follow *Annotationes ad Dionys. Perieg. ad Eustathii Commentarios, ad Scholia, and ad Niceph. Blemm. Paraphrasin.* At the end are given four indices. 1. *Index verborum Dionysii.* 2. *Index rerum.* 3. *Index auctorum Eustath. Scholiorumque.* 4. *Index auctorum quos annotatio tractat.* The preface to the work gives an account of the merits and defects of the former editions: it is written in a severe and caustic manner; but we are sure it will be read with great interest. The *Comment. de Dionys. Perieg.* at the head of vol. II. treats of the time when Dionys. may be supposed to have written the *Periegesis*. Scaliger, Salmasius, Dodwell, &c. differed about the precise time; but they agree in assuming that Dionys. lived in the second century: Bernhardy refutes them all; and proves, by an argument which we conceive to be unanswerable, that Dionys. lived either at the end of the third, or at the beginning of the fourth century: for mention is made, v. 730. of the Huns; and these were, according to Zonaras, first heard of in the time of the Emperor Carus; for the Chinni, mentioned by Ptolemaeus, lived at a great distance from the Huns of Dionys., who are found near the Caspian Sea. The commentary of Bernhardy appears to contain all that is really necessary and useful to know, without that crude and tiresome accumulation of notes copied from preceding editors or writers on the subject. "Satis jam librorum vilium et nugarum inficetarum . . .," says B., "oblivione perpetua tandem aliquando viam illam impedimentorum obruemus quo sacris his expiatis firmitate animi qua opus est et hilaritate muneri gravissimo incumbamus."

Aratus cum Scholiis. Recognovit IMM. BEKKERUS. Berolini,
 1828.

Within a short time there have been several editions of Aratus in Germany, viz. by Buhle, who published also the *Scholia*; Matthiæ (Frankfort, 1824.) and J. H. Voss (Heidelberg, 1821.) who published the text with an excellent German translation. The *scholia* are more correctly given in the present edition. Bekker has besides collated 13 codd., 7 Paris codd., 2 Vatican and 2 Venet. codd., besides the codd. Casanatensis, Laurentianus, and Palatinus. Indices are given at the end.

Nouvelle Grammaire Hébraïque Raisonnée et Comparée. By M. SARCHI, LL.D. at the University of Vienna. In 8vo. 10 francs. Paris.

Chap. 1st treats of pronunciation: the rules of this part of the Grammar are presented with clearness and precision; and the author has omitted nothing that is necessary, nor has he mentioned any thing superfluous. The second chapter is very long, containing 190 pages, treating of lexicology: the matter contained in this chap. is developed with great superiority of talent. The third chapter treats of syntax, and contains many new and luminous ideas which mark a consummate Hebraist. The fourth chapter treats of prosody: in this chapter the author has banished from his work a fantastical vocabulary, imagined in the 15th century, which no one will regret but the lovers of routine, full of a blind respect to superannuated doctrines. The fifth chapter contains rules on orthography, letters, and vowel-points, &c.: this chapter contains new ideas on the point denominated *daguesch*, which corresponds in general with the *teshild* of the Arabs. Thematology forms the subject of the sixth chapter, which contains some excellent observations on servile and radical letters. The vol. is terminated by an Appendix on the Hebrew name of the Divinity, called ineffable by the Israelites, which they dare not pronounce. This dissertation proves the great erudition of the author. The esteem of the learned of all religions will be a recompense to M. Sarchi for his laborious work.

Correction of the Oriental Names used by the traveller *Schiltberg*.

By M. JOS. DE HAMMER, (*Denkschriften der Königl. Akad. der Wissenschaft zu München.*) Vol. ix. p. 217.

We shall content ourselves with pointing out this article to the attention of the learned, without analysing it. Its object, as the title announces, is to rectify the European orthography of Oriental words, as followed by the ancient Bavarian traveller, *Jean Schiltberg*. We are far from being so severe on this point as M. Hammer is: we would leave to every one the liberty to spell Oriental words according to his own particular judgment, provided always that the words be recognisable in their European costume. Several of the Oriental characters have no correspondent letter in our European languages; their transcription must, therefore, necessarily be arbitrary: besides, our characters have a different sound, according to the different countries; thus, for example, to render the Arabic letter [ش] *shin*, the Germans employ the letters *sch*, the French *ch*, and ourselves *sh*. How, therefore, is it possible to expect that all the learned of Europe should adopt one uniform system of orthography? It is well known that the late M. de Volney founded prizes to encourage the learned to occupy themselves on this great question; but the memoirs that have been written on the subject have unquestionably proved that it is impossible to resolve it in a satisfactory manner.

Cours de Littérature Grecque Moderne: a Course of Lectures on Modern Greek Literature, delivered at Geneva by JACORAKY-

RIZO-NEROGLIS; published by Jean Humbert. 2nd edition. 8vo. Geneva, 1828. Treuttel and Würtz.

The literary condition of the Hellenists of the present day offers an ample subject to the investigation of the learned and to the reflections of men of observation: we have reason to be astonished that a people that have groaned for so long a term under the oppression of a barbarous master, should have been able not only to retain to the present day the sacred flame of the *bellas-lettres*, but even to attain to a rank relatively much elevated in the cultivation of the intellectual faculties. The work contains *an introduction to the history of the Greek language*, in which the author displays vast erudition; and exposes, with precision and truth, the origin of the language of the modern Greeks, whose source is derived from the corruption of the ancient idiom. The modern Greek differs not essentially from the ancient: they are, says M. Rizo, but one and the same language, which time has gradually subjected to modifications; the usage of some Turkish and Italian words, and the particular acceptance given to some ancient words, constitute the principal alterations which the Greek language has suffered in becoming what it is at this day. From the capture of Constantinople in 1453, until the beginning of the 18th century, this language remained almost stationary; during this long period, authors wrote in ancient Greek in the same manner as in the west of Europe: the Latin was for a long time the only language used by the few who knew how to write; and in the same manner as the Koranic Arabic was used long after Mohamet (Mahomet) by the Arabian authors, whilst the language of the various people was much altered. In the appendix to this work will be found a critical review of the principal works of modern Greek literature. The volume is terminated by instructive notes, extremely interesting, containing historical facts little known, but very curious.

Des Nouvelles Découvertes sur l'Écriture Égyptienne dans leurs rapports avec la Bible. By M. C. C. (Revue Protestante, No. 31, p. 1 to 21.)

The learned author of this notice sufficiently discovers the contents of the work by the title itself. After having analysed and methodically exposed the new discoveries in the knowledge of the Egyptian writings, he considers them in their results, as applied to the historical part of our holy books, which lead him successively to speak of the pastor kings of Genesis; of the contemporaneity of Moses and Sesostris; of the Zodiacs of Esnakh and of Dendera; of the names of the kings mentioned in the Bible, and discovered in the Egyptian inscriptions. After a general view of the importance of these discoveries to ancient history, the author concludes that they fully confirm the Christian faith, and the authority of the sacred Hebrew books.

Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia; recensuit FILON. In 61°. Paris. Sautelet, 1828.

This volume is as small as one's thumb; it is a model of typography, and surpasses in the smallness and neatness of the character every thing that has hitherto appeared most perfect in France and in England. The type of Henry Didot is so fine, that it is scarcely perceivable with

the naked eye; a magnifying glass must be used to read it. Amateurs must place this literary jewel not in a library, but in a cabinet.

Biblical Repertory. A Collection of Tracts in Biblical Literature. By CHARLES HODGE, *Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey.* Vols. I. II. and III. Princeton, 1825—1827. 8vo.

This work is offered to his countrymen, by Professor Hodge, as a vehicle by which information contained in expensive and rare volumes may be conveyed to biblical students at a reasonable price. We are glad to see such a work commenced in the American Union, and hope that it will meet with the encouragement it deserves. As its title implies, the subjects, principally discussed relate to the criticism of the text of Scripture, to the ancient versions, to critical editions, to Hermeneutics, biblical antiquities, and the literary history of the sacred volume. Exegetical treatises on important passages of Scripture, biographical notices of biblical writers, and accounts of the most important biblical works, are likewise inserted; and, occasionally, disquisitions on some topics of ecclesiastical history. The work is, *avowedly*, not intended to be original in its general character, but to consist of selections from the writings of the most distinguished British and Continental critics and Oriental scholars; hence it will not be necessary to offer any extracts, especially as the treatises whence this collection of tracts is taken have long been familiar to the majority of English biblical scholars. As, however, we have reason to think that very few copies have reached this country, we subjoin the following analysis of their contents for the gratification of our readers.

Vol. I. contains translations of—1. Beck's *Monogrammata Hermeneutices Novi Testamenti*. 2. Tittmann's *Dissertation on Historical Interpretation*. 3. Warnekros *de Fertilitate Palestinæ*. 4. Extracts from Stæudlin's *History of Theological Knowledge* (from the German). 5. Knappius *de Spiritu Sancto et Christo, Paraclitis*. 6. Morus on the *Style of the New Testament*, and his rules for discovering the *Usus Loquendi* of the New Testament. (The substance of these observations has long been before British readers in the second volume of Mr. Hartwell Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*.) 7. Michaelis on the *Population of Palestine*, (this is to be found in Dr. Smith's *Translation of Michaelis's Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*); and reprints of the following Disquisitions by English biblical critics; viz. 8. Bishop Warburton on *Types and Secondary Senses*; Remarks on the *Propriety of a New Translation of the Scriptures in English* (ascribed to the venerable Bishop of Salisbury); and Archbishop Laurence's *Critical Remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament*.

Vol. II. contains reprints of—1. Extracts from Bentley's *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*. 2. Archbishop Laurence's *Remarks on Griesbach's Classification of Manuscripts*. 3. The Rev. H. J. Rose on the *State of the Protestant Church in Germany*, *Sermons I. and II.*; and translations of the following articles; viz. 4. Storr on the various uses of the word ΠΑΡΕΜΑ. 5. On the *Antiquity of Coined Money*, from the French of Calmet. 6. On the *Genuineness of Isaiah's Prophecies*, from the German of Jahn, who satisfactorily vindicates their genuineness. 7. *Analytical Comparison of the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic*

Languages, from the *Annals of Oriental Literature*. 8. Knappe's Dissertation on 2 Pet. i. 19—21. 9. Account of the Life and Writings of John David Michaelis, from Eichhorn's *Allgemeine Bibliothek*. 10. Herder's *Dialogues on the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, translated from the German. This volume has one original essay on the Antiquity and History of the Hebrew Language, compiled from Bishop Walton's *Prolegomena*, Loescher de *Causis Linguae Hebraeae*, Gesenius's *Geschichte der Hebraischen Sprache*, (*History of the Hebrew Language*.) and Leusden's *Philologus Hebraeus*.

Vol. III. contains—1. The conclusion of Mr. Rose's Sermons on the State of the Protestant Church in Germany. 2. A translation from the Latin of J. G. Walchius's Dissertation on the Mode of Catechetical Instruction pursued by the Apostles. 3. Five tracts on the Interpretation of Scripture, translated from the *Opuscula Philologico-Critica* of Jo. Aug. Eusebi. 4. A Refutation of the Hypothesis of the Papists in relation to the Interpretation of the Scriptures, translated from Jo. Alphonso Turretin's (or Turrettini's) *Treatise de Interpretatione Scripturae*. 5. A Translation from the Greek of Justin the Martyr's Exhortation to the Greeks. 6. Hints on the Importance of the Old Testament, from the German of Prof. Augustus Tholuck. 7. The conclusion of Herder's *Dialogues on the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*. 8. A Translation of Reinhard's Latin Dissertation on Miracles. 9. Illustrations of the Elementary Principles of the Structure of Language, reprinted from the *Quarterly Journal of Science, Literature, and the Arts*, New Series, Vol. I. No. I. 10. An Extract from Mr. Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, in regard to the claim of Infallibility. 11. On the Gospel of St. John, translated from Eichhorn's (German) *Introduction to the New Testament*. Besides various "Gleanings," principally from British journals and other publications.

These volumes are printed with singular neatness, and on good paper. One number for the year 1828, we believe, has appeared; but whether the "*Biblical Repertory*" has met with sufficient encouragement for its further continuance, we have, at present, no means of ascertaining.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Mr. VALPY has just published No. XXXIX of *Stephens' Greek Thesaurus*, containing the Index. Thus the Work is comprised in 39 Numbers; and though this last exceeds the size of three common Numbers, yet it is charged only as *one* to the regular Subscribers. In consequence, however, of its great extent, Mr. V. will feel himself at liberty to charge a higher price after the 1st of March next, when required to complete *imperfect* sets.

Many persons connected with *public* as well as *private* Libraries having declined to subscribe, until the whole work should be completed, they are now invited to make immediate application, as Mr. V. has not more than a dozen perfect copies

in his possession, which may be had at 1*l.* 5*s.* per No. Small, and 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Large Paper. These copies may be had in sets or in parts monthly, should such an arrangement best suit the purchaser. The price will soon be raised. Those gentlemen who have *incomplete* copies are requested to perfect them, as the price has *already been raised* on such Nos. as are in arrear, and will from time to time be further advanced.

The Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. 121 to 124, containing the *Panegyrici Veteres* and part of *Aurelius Victor*. Pr. 1*l.* 1*s.* per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two back Nos. with each new No. till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

The Medea of Euripides, from the Text, and with a Translation of the Notes, Preface, and Supplement of PORSON; critical and explanatory Remarks, partly original, partly selected from other Commentators; Illustrations of Idioms from Matthiæ, Dawes, Viger, &c. &c.; a Synopsis of Metrical Systems; Examination Questions; and copious Indexes. For the use of Schools and Students. By the Rev. J. R. MAJOR, Trin. Coll. Camb., and Master of Wisbeach School. 12mo. Price 5*s.* bds.

The Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles; with copious critical and explanatory Notes in English. By the Rev. J. BRASSE, D.D. Price 5*s.* 6*d.* bds.

Viger's Greek Idioms; translated into English, and abridged for the use of Schools. By the Rev. J. SEAGER, Author of 'Critical Observations on Classical Authors,' and several Greek Criticisms in the Classical Journal. Price 9*s.* 6*d.* 8vo. bds.

Second Greek Delectus; or a New *Analecta Minora*. By the Rev. F. VALPY, Trin. Coll. Camb., and one of the Masters of Reading School. 8vo. Price 9*s.*

This work is intended to be read in schools after Dr. Valpy's *Greek Delectus*. It retains a third of the Greek of Dalzel's *Analecta Minora*, and derives the remainder of its Text from other sources. The Notes are in English, are very explanatory of the Syntax and difficulties of the Greek, and are placed by themselves at the end of the Text. The Lexicon is Greek and English; and almost universally facilitates the remembrance of the words of the Greek Text by the insertion of words derived from them in Latin or in English, and by a careful investigation of their derivation. All such difficult parts of verbs as occur in the Work are put in their alphabetical order, and referred to their proper sense and root.

I. *Cicero's Catilinarian Orations*, from the Text of Ernesti; with some Notes by the Editor, E. H. BARKER, Esq., of Thetford, Norfolk, and many selected from Ernesti's edition of Cicero's works, from his *Clavis Ciceroniana*, from Scheller and Ernestus Antonius: and with Extracts from Andreas Schottus's Dissertation, entitled *Cicero a Calumniis Vindicatus*.—II. *Tacitus's Dialogus de Oratoribus sive de Causis Corruptæ Eloquentiæ*, from the Text of Schulze, 1788.—III. *Several beautiful Extracts from English Authors*, with a Suggestion to the Conductors of Classical Schools to devote one day in the week to the study of English Literature. Pr. 5s. 6d. 12mo. bds.

Latin Grammar. A new edition. By R. VALPY, D.D. F.A.S. Pr. 2s. 6d. 12mo.

First Exercises; to be translated into Latin, with Familiar Explanations. By R. VALPY, D.D. F.A.S. A new edition. Pr. 1s. 6d.

The 5th and last Part of Bagster's quarto edition of *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*. This Part contains the entire New Testament in five Languages. The Syriac Version is to be sold separately.

Dr. Bostock has just published a translation of the 1st and 3rd Books of *Pliny* as a Specimen of a proposed translation of the whole work with Notes, &c.

A Manual of Parochial Psalmody, comprising Select Portions from the Old and New Versions of the Psalms; together with Hymns for the principal Festivals, &c. of the Church of England, revised and adapted to the Service of the Church, for every Sunday, &c. throughout the year. By the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, M.A. 18mo.

The title of this Manual of Psalmody (which is dedicated to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury) completely expresses its design and contents: and as some of the editor's corrections of the New Version of the Psalms by Tate and Brady are, strictly speaking, *critical* corrections, this circumstance gives it a place in our Journal. In his preface, the editor has given a concise history of the Church of England Psalmody, together with a statement of the reasons which now render it necessary that *Christian* congregations should have other compositions for singing, besides merely literal versions of *Jewish* Psalms. The portions, selected from the Old Version of Sternhold and Hopkins and from the New Version, are upwards of one hundred and forty in number; and they contain the finest passages, for divine worship, of both versions. The Hymns, or imitations of Psalms, are selected from the best authors of that species of composition, both British and Anglo-American. Every mystical expression (and it is well known that many of the finest Hymns in our language have a

mystical turn) has been carefully altered or omitted. The whole are strictly congregational, that is, such as may be sung by every individual in a congregation. Two features distinguish this volume, and render it peculiarly a Manual of Parochial Psalmody; viz.—

1. The editor has prefixed a copious arrangement of Psalms and Hymns, adapted generally to the subjects of the First Lessons, Epistles, Gospels, or Collects, for every Sunday, Festival, &c. throughout the Ecclesiastical year; and also for the administration of the two Sacraments, for Charity Sermons of different kinds, Laying the Foundation-stone or Consecration of Churches or Parochial Chapels, Visitations, Funerals, and various ecclesiastical and other occasions, for which some such help has long been a desideratum. The Introits before the Communion-service are from those Psalms which were appointed to be sung (chorally, in the Prayer Book version,) as introits in King Edward VI.'s first Liturgy, printed in 1549, and which, according to Wheatley, had reference generally to the season of the year or to the service of the day: so that this part of Mr. Horne's plan is in effect an attempt to bring back our Psalmody to that order which it obtained at the Reformation.

2. To each Psalm there is prefixed a brief preface, pointing out its scope, and, if it be a prophetic Psalm, its application to the Messiah. These prefaces are abridged either from Bishop Horne's Commentary, from Bishop Mant's recent metrical version of the Psalms, or from the black-letter prefaces which were prefixed to the Psalms in the earlier editions of the Old Version, and many of which were very judicious, though they have been unaccountably omitted in all the modern editions of that version.

Altogether, this neatly printed volume is one of the most comprehensive Manuals of Parochial Psalmody, as it is the cheapest, which has fallen under our notice.

The Celtic Druids. By GODFREY HIGGINS, Esq. Ato. With many beautiful Engravings. Price 3*l.* 3*s.* bds. Hunter, London.

It is impossible to do justice to this volume by any critique, but our readers may form the best idea of the work by the following extract from the table of contents.

Preliminary Observations—Necessity of Etymology—Alphabets—Explanation of the Alphabets—Changes in Language—Theory respecting Figures—Division of the Year and Circle—Druids acquainted with Letters—Objection to the Passage of Cæsar's—Ingenuity of Mr. Ledwich—Two Ancient Alphabets—Irish, Greek, and Hebrew Letters the same—Slight Difference in the Alphabets—English and Arabic Alphabets the same as the others—Ogams of Ireland—Hercules Ogmios Ogam Writings yet exist—Affinity between the Languages—Argument concluded—Peculiarity of the Irish Alphabet—Irish Letters compared with Hebrew—Possible Use of the above System—Hieroglyphics—Ciphering invented before Letters—A Mazy Concern—Holy Fury—Virgil a Druid—Welsh Letters—Runes of the North—Allusions to Trees—Most Ancient Alphabets—When the Ogam Writing was invented—Tenth Chapter of Genesis—The Eleventh Chapter of Genesis misplaced—The Author's Hypothesis supported by Mr. Bryant—Transposition of Part of the Eleventh Chapter of Genesis—Great Knowledge displayed in the Tenth Chapter of Genesis—Examination of Ararat and Armenia—D'Herbelot's Opinion—St. Jerom respecting Babylon and Shinar Nineveh near to Babylon—M. Bailie's Hypothesis on a Primeval Nation—M. Bailie's Doctrines—Opinions of Bailie, Buffon, and Linné, on the Earth and on Man—Bailie's

Reasons for his Hypothesis—Cycle of the Neros—Baillie on the Seven-day Cycle—Sir W. Drummond supports Baillie—Mr. Ledwich also supports Baillie—Persia, India, and China, the Depositories, not the Inventors of Science—Who the Celts were—The Celts were Gomerians—Pezzon's Summary of the different Opinions—Observation respecting the Opposition of Priests—Summary of the Argument—The Umbri and Etruscans—Affinity between the Latin, Sanscrit, and Celtic—Affinity between the Hebrew and the Celtic—Affinity between the Greek, Sanscrit, and Celtic—The term Barbarian—The Celts the First Swarm from the Parent Hive—Cimmerian Bosphorus, Italy, Cumæ, Spain, Greece—Swarms cast off into the South—Nothing to impede the Advance of the Tribes—Example of the Cimbri—Reflections on the Example of the Cimbri—Reasons against the Existence of an Ancient Nation not Auld—The Scythians—Colonel Vallancey impolitic—Arrival of Phœnician Colonies in Ireland—Origin of the Irish Fables—Irish Bards—Mr. O'Connor's Doctrines not approved by the Author, &c. &c. &c.

• IN THE PRESS. •

Hoogveen on the Greek Particles ; translated into English, and abridged for the Use of Schools, on the plan of *Viger's Greek Idioms*. By the Rev. J. SEAGER. Will be published in February.—It is the intention of the Editor to undertake, on the same plan, *Bos and Hermann* ; which two works will be published as soon as possible.

• PREPARING FOR THE PRESS. •

The Rev. F. Valpy, author of the “*Second Greek Delectus*,” is preparing for publication a *Second Latin Delectus*, with copious English Notes at the end. It is intended to be used after Dr. Valpy's “*Latin Delectus*,” and before Valpy's “*Analecta Majora Latina*.”

• FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE. •

— Contents of the ‘*Journal des Savans*’ for July, 1828. —

1. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. [2nd Art. de M. Abel-Rémusat.]
2. De l'Éducation des Sourds-muets de naissance, par M. Degeando. [2nd Art. de M. le Baron Sylvestre de Sacy.]
3. Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences de l'Institut de France. Tomes 1—7. [Art. de M. Chevreuil.]
4. Voyage de la Grèce, par F. C. H. L. Pouqueville. [2nd Art. de M. Letronne.]
5. Notice et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, et autres Bibliothèques, publiés par l'Institut Royal de France. Tome xi. [Art. de M. Daunou.]
6. Recherches Anatomiques et Physiologiques, sur la Circulation dans les Crustacées, par MM. Audouin et Milne Edwards. [Art. de M. Tessier.]

August.—1. Notice sur le Voyage de M. Schulz en Orient, et sur les Découvertes qu'il a faites récemment dans les Ruines de la ville de Samiramis. [Art. de M. Saint-Martin.]

2. Anthologie Arabe, ou choix de Poésies inédites, par M. Grange-et de La Grange. [Art. de M. Sylvestre de Sacy.]

3. *Papiri Græco-Egizj, ed altri Greci Monumenti* dell' J. R. Museo de Corte, da Giovanni Petrettiui.

4. *Notice et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, et autres Bibliothèques, publiés par l'Institut Royal de France. Tome xi.* [2nd Art. de M. Daunou.]

5. *Histoire des Végétaux Fossiles, ou Recherches Botaniques et Géologiques sur les Végétaux renfermés dans les diverses couches du Globe*, par M. Adolphe Brogniart. [Art. de M. Tessier.]

September.—1. *Le Goupillon*, poème héroï comique, traduit du Portugais d'Antoine Dinsys. [Art. de M. Raynouard.]

2. *Grammar of the Language of the Lenox-Ienex-Ienape of the Delaware Indians*, by D. Zeisberger, translated by P. DuRoi. [Art. de Abel-Rémusat.]

3. *Description de l'Ancienne Arménie*, par le P. Élie Indjikian. [Art. de M. Saint-Martin.]

4. *Voyage de la Grèce*, par M. F. C. H. Pouqueville. [3me Art. de M. Letronne.]

5. *Numophylacium Universitatis Casaræ Litterarum Casaniensis Orientale delineavit Franc. Eddian.* [Art. de M. le Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

6. *Histoire du Gnosticisme*, par M. Matter. [Art. de M. Daunou.]

Royal Institute of France and Academic Societies, August, 1828.

The Academy proposes as a prize subject for poetry, to be decreed in 1829, *the invention of Printing*. The works sent for competition will be received up to the 15th May, 1829. They should be sent free of expense to the secretary of the Institute, within the term prescribed, bearing a motto or device, which is to be repeated in a note accompanying the work, and containing the name of the author. The prize is a gold medal, value 1500 francs, or 60*l.* sterling.

The Academy, at the meeting on the 25th of August, 1827, proposed three extraordinary prizes (arising out of the foundation of M. de Montyon) for works of moral utility; and determined on the subjects for 1829 and 1830, leaving that for 1828 to the choice of the authors. Forty-one works, on as many different subjects, have been sent: of which the Academy regrets that not one has been thought worthy of the prize; and postpones to the year 1829, the prize which has thus remained undisposed of.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Elémens d'Algèbre, for the use of the Pupils destined for the Polytechnic School, the Navy, the Military School of St. Cyr, &c. By the Baron Reynard, examiner for the admission to those Academies, &c. A work adopted by the University of Paris, 7th edition. Price 7½ francs.

ἌΤΑΚΤΑ ἡγουν παντοδαπῶν . . . A Collection of Various Observations on the Ancient and Modern Greek Languages; Vol. i. containing two poems of Theodore Prodrome, with Prolegomena,

Notes, and five tables, published by M. Coray. Paris, 1828. Firmin Didot.

De Syntipa et Cyri filio Andropoli Narratio, &c. Cold. Paris, edita a Jo. Boissonade. Parisus, apud fratres Debuſſe, 1828. 12mo. Price 4 francs.

M. T. Ciceronis libri de Dinctione et de Fato. Francof. ad Mœn. 1828. 8vo.

We particularly announce this edition, because it contains the notes of Creuzer.

Friderici Sylburgi Epistolæ quinque, &c. Francofurti, 1827. 12 pages.

These five letters of Sylburg to Melissus or Schede were unpublished; it is M. T. Creuzer who now publishes them.

De Ethiopica Linguae Conjugationibus Commentatio. By M. Dieckster. 8vo. 94 pages, price 12 gro. Leipsig, 1827. Vogel.

The Ethiopian language resembles the Arabic both in regard to the words and to the grammatical forms, so that nothing would be more easy for an Arabist to learn than this language; but as it is almost confined to biblical interest, it will always be neglected in Catholic countries, where it is of little use to throw light on the true meaning of the sacred text, since they are obliged to hold to the Vulgate, notwithstanding the innumerable errors which it contains.

Carafa Meleæta cum Scholiis Zuerii; textum ad fidem Mss. Parisiensium diligenter emendavit, vitam auctoris accuratius exposuit, annotationes Reiskii selectas suis subjunxit, interpretationem Latinam addidit Johannes Vullers.

Published by subscription at 6 francs, which after a time will be doubled. Bonn, by Habicht, bookseller, and at Paris by N. Mase, bookseller.

Revue de 63 Ouvrages de Littérature Orientale. (Jahrbucher der Literatur de Vienne, Vol. xxix. P. 1. and Vol. xl. P. 1.)

M. de Hammer has collected under one view the greater part of the works published in Europe on Oriental literature, from 1821 to 1827, amounting to 63. The number of the orientalist who have published them is 50. More than half of these are Germans; the remainder are English, French, Dutch, Swedish, and only one Spaniard (*Condé*), and one Pole (*Senkowshy*). M. Hammer has excluded from his review the works written in dead languages, such as the Hebrew and the Sanscrit; his review extends only to the writings relative to the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish; he has inserted a great number of critical remarks and philological observations on the Oriental authors. This review is particularly interesting to Orientalists.

Histoire générale de l'Inde ancienne et moderne, from the 2000th year before J. C. to our days; preceded by a geographical notice, and distinct treatises on the chronology, religion, philosophy, legislation, literature, sciences, arts, and commerce of the Hindoos. By M. de Marles. With a map of ancient and modern

India. 6 vols. 8vo. price 7 francs each vol. Paris, 1828. Enter. The first four volumes of this work are on sale; the remaining two will soon appear.

S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi, de Civitate Dei, Libri XXI. 2 vols. 12mo common paper 7, fine paper 10 francs Paris, Dondey Dupré.

Abuljedæ Annales Moslemici; Latinos ex Arabicis fecit J. Jac. Reiske. Lips. 1751. 4to. Dondey Dupré, Paris. 9 francs

Biblia Hebraica, ad optimas quasque editiones expressa, cum notis Masorethicis, numeris distinctionum, &c. &c., accurate Christ. Remercio. Lips. 1730 4to. v. m. 25 francs. Dondey Dupré, Paris.

L'Exode expliqué d'après les textes primitifs. The Book of Exodus explained according to the original primitive text, with answers to the difficulties of the incredulous, by the Abbé du Contant de la Mollette. Paris, 1780. 3 vols. 12mo. price 4 francs 50 cents.

Genesis, idem. Paris, 1777. Idem. 4 francs 50 cents.

Polygraphie; or the art of corresponding, with the aid of a dictionary, in all languages, even in those of which we do not possess the alphabetical letters. Hourwitz. Paris. 8vo Price 1½ francs. Dondey Dupré.

Origine des Langues. By Zalkind Hourwitz. Paris. 8vo. Dondey Dupré. Price 2½ francs.

Die Germanen und Griechen. The Germans and the Greeks, the same people and language. By J. G. Kuithan. Ham. 1822, 1825 and 1826. Wundermann (Annonces Scientifiques de Goettingue. Feb. 1828. p. 259.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received the works of Dr. Parr, and shall in our future Nos. give our readers some few Extracts, which will not fail to prove most useful, as the work abounds with many letters connected with Greek and Latin criticism.

We hope to give *Blomfield's and Monk's Canons* in our next.

